Maryland
S
71
.2

Report of

The Maryland Agricultural Society—
The Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.

INCLUDING REPORTS OF THE

Maryland State Horticultural Society,
Maryland Crop Improvement Association,
Maryland State Beekeepers' Association,
Maryland Vegetable Growers' Association,
Maryland Stockmen's Association,
Maryland Tobacco Growers' Association,
Maryland State Poultry Council,
Associated Women of the
Maryland Farm Bureau,
4-H Club Conference,
Maryland Nurserymen's Association

LIBRARY—COLLEGE PARK

REPORT OF

MARYLAND AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

THE MARYLAND FARM BUREAU, Inc.

Including Reports of

The Maryland State Horticultural Society
The Maryland Crop Improvement Association
The Maryland State Beekeepers' Association
The Maryland Vegetable Growers' Association
The Maryland Stockmen's Association
The Maryland Tobacco Growers' Association
Maryland State Poultry Council
Associated Women of the Maryland Farm Bureau
4-H Club Conference
Maryland Nurserymen's Association

Volume XXVIII, for the year 1943

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY MAY, 1944
EDITED BY C. E. WISE AND T. B. SYMONS
BALTIMORE, MD.

Maryland
S
71
.A2
vol.28

SEP 14 1945 GIFT

R.S.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To His Excellency, Herbert R. O'Conor,
Governor of Maryland.

Sir:

I herewith submit to you, as directed by the Act incorporating the Maryland Agricultural Society, and also the Horticultural Society, this report for the year 1943, which contains a detailed statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Society as approved by the Executive Committee and Advisory Council. It contains the proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Annual Meeting of the Maryland Agricultural Society, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., and annual meetings of the Affiliated Associations.

I trust that an inspection of its contents will convince you that the funds appropriated for this purpose have been wisely and judiciously expended.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES E. WISE, JR.
Secretary

February 8, 1944.
Baltimore, Md.

113817

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MARYLAND FARM BUREAU, Inc
1944

R. C. F. Weagly	Hagerstown, Md.
H. S. Leaverton	Rock Hall, Md.
C. E. Wise, Jr.	Baltimore, Md.
H. J. Barton	Pinto, Md.
O. F. Grimes	Davidsonville, Md.
F. Ridgely Todd	Sparrows Point, Md.
Julius Parran	Lusby, Md.
C. J. Kern	Denton, Md.
Jesse Hull	Westminster, Md.
D. B. McDowell	Nottingham, Pa.
S. C. Linton	Grayton, Md.
S. W. Linthicum	Cambridge, Md.
A. M. Etzler	Walkersville, Md.
T. S. Anderson	Frederick, Md.
Wm. Winterberg	Grantsville, Md.
Wilson A. Heaps	Pylesville, Md.
Wm. Ledbetter	Ellicott City, Md.
J. D. King	Germantown, Md.
H. C. Townshend	Upper Marlboro, Md.
John W. Smith	Sudlersville, Md.
Frank D. Hayden	Great Mills, Md.
Wm. T. Chaffey	Marion Station, Md.
Francis Schwaninger	Easton, Md.
D. E. Rinehart	Smithsburg, Md.
C. C. Phillips	Quantico, Md.
S. O. Northam	Snow Hill, Md.
Mrs. C. J. Kern	Denton, Md.
Mrs. Randall Spoerlein	New Windsor, Md.
H. H. Nuttle	Denton, Md.
P. C. Turner	Balto. Md.
Mrs. Atlee Armour	North East, Md.
Mrs. Ralph Shockley	Snow Hill, Md.
Mrs. L. A. Sutton	Chestertown, Md.
Mrs. John Flook	Keedysville, Md.
Mrs. R. C. F. Weagly	Hagerstown, Md.
Mrs. P. D. Brown	La Plata, Md.
T. B. Symons	University of Md., College Park Md.
H. C. Byrd	University of Md. College Park Md.
T. Roy Brookes	Bel Air, Md.
Henry Whiteford	Whiteford, Md.
R. W. Shermantine	810 Fidelity Bldg., Baltimore, Md.
Edwin Warfield, Jr.	15 E. Saratoga St., Baltimore, Md.
J. A. Cohill	Hancock, Md.
H. H. Rieck	Preston, Md.
J. H. Snyder	Union Bridge, Md.
J. E. McCue	State Tobacco Warehouse, Baltimore, Md.
Geo. H. Strattman	Sparrows Point, Md.
E. N. Cory	University of Md., College Park Md.
Janon Fisher, Jr.	Eccleston, Md.
D. B. Stoner	Westminster, Md.

PRESIDENTS AND SECRETARIES OF COUNTY FARM BUREAUS

Allegany

Harry Barton, President ---------- Pinto, Md.
Mrs. Mabel A. White, Secretary ---------- 215 Lee St., Cumberland, Md.

Anne Arundel

O. F. Grimes, President ---------- Davidsonville, Md.
Preston Harrison, Secretary ---------- Annapolis, Md.

Baltimore

F. Ridgely Todd, President ---------- Sparrows Point, Md.
G. W. Sattler, Secretary ---------- Monkton, Md.

Calvert

Julius Parran, President ---------- Lusby, Md.
J. B. Morsell, Secretary ---------- Prince Frederick, Md.

Caroline

Richard Blackburn, President ---------- Ridgely, Md.
F. D. Zeigler, Secretary ---------- Denton, Md.

Carroll

Jesse Hull, President ---------- Westminster, Md.
Edwin Englar, Secretary ---------- New Windsor, Md.

Cecil

D. B. McDowell, President ---------- Nottingham, Pa.
J. S. Reisler, Secretary ---------- Nottingham, Pa.

Charles

Samuel Linton, President ---------- Grayton, Md.
Eloise Gardiner, Secretary ---------- La Pata, Md.

Dorchester

Sam Linthicum, President ---------- Cambridge, Md.
Reginald Jones, Secretary ---------- Cambridge, Md.

Frederick

A. M. Etzler, President ---------- Walkersville, Md.
T. S. Anderson, Secretary ---------- Frederick, Md.

Garrett

William Winterberg, President ---------- Grantsville, Md.
Charlie B. Miller, Secretary ---------- Friendsville, Md.

Harford

Wilson A. Heaps, President ---------- Pylesville, Md.
A. G. Ensor, Secretary ---------- Forest Hill, Md.

Howard

William Ledbetter, President ---------- Ellicott City, Md.
G. Cashell Nichols, Secretary ---------- Highland, Md.

Kent

H. S. Leaverton, President ---------- Rock Hall, Md.
Frank O. Sutton, Secretary ---------- Chestertown, Md.

Montgomery

James D. King, President ---------- Germantown, Md.
Ullyses Griffith, IV, Secretary ---------- Laytonsville, Md.

Prince George's

H. C. Townshend, President ---------- Upper Marlboro, Md.
Miss Clara Anne King, Secretary ---------- Upper Marlboro, Md.

Queen Anne's

John Smith, President ---------- Sudlersville, Md.
William T. Thomas, Secretary ---------- Centreville, Md.

St Mary's

Frank Hayden, President ---------- Great Mills, Md.
Mrs. Elizabeth Russell, Secretary ---------- Leonardtown, Md.

Somerset

William T. Chaffey, President ---------- Marion Station, Md.
J. M. Lankford, Secretary ---------- Pocomoke City, Md.

Talbot

Francis Schwaninger, President ---------- Easton, Md.
G. Brent Rieman, Secretary ---------- Easton, Md.

Washington

D. E. Rinehart, President ---------- Smithsburg, Md.
William Hovermale, Secretary ---------- Rohrersville, Md.

Wicomico

C. C. Phillips, President ---------- Quantico, Md.
S. R. Atkinson, Secretary ---------- Salisbury, Md.

Worcester

S. O. Northam, President ---------- Snow Hill, Md.
Lester D. Shockley, Secretary ---------- Snow Hill, Md.

MARYLAND FARM BUREAU INCORPORATED
1944 OFFICERS

President, R. C. F. Weagly, Hagerstown, Md. R. F. D.
Vice-President, Howard S. Leaverton, Rock Hall, Md.
Secretary-Treasurer, C. E. Wise, Jr., Sherwood Building, Baltimore, Md.

OFFICERS OF AFFILIATED ASSOCIATIONS

Maryland Horticultural Society

President, Dwight T. Walker ---------- Mt. Airy, Md.
Secretary-Treasurer, A. F. Vierheller ---------- College Park Md.

Maryland Crop Improvement Association

President, Willis L. Cissel ---------- Woodbine, Md.
Secretary-Treasurer, Albin Kuhn ---------- College Park, Md.

Maryland Cooperative Milk Producers, Inc.

President, D. S. Pearce ---------- Sparks, Md.
Secretary, R. W. Shermantine, 810 Fidelity Building ---- Baltimore, Md.

Maryland State Beekeepers' Association

President, Harold L. Kelley ---------- Forest Glen, Md.
Secretary-Treasurer, George J. Abrams ---------- College Park, Md.

Maryland State Vegetable Growers' Association

President, J. E. Andrews ---------- Hurlock, Md.
Secretary-Treasurer, W. R. Ballard ---------- College Park, Md.

Maryland Tobacco Growers' Association

President, Carroll Lee ---------- Annapolis, Md.
Secretary, Thomas W. Jones ---------- Lothian, Md.
General Manager, George Sachse, State
Tobacco Warehouse ---------- Baltimore, Md.

Maryland Stockmen's Association

President, Jesse Shirley ---------- Reisterstown, Md.
Secretary-Treasurer, U. G. Bee ---------- College Park, Md.

Maryland Horse Breeders' Association, Inc.

President, Janon Fisher, Jr. ---------- Eccleston, Md.
Secretary, Goss L. Stryker ---------- Timonium, Md.

Maryland State Poultry Council

President, Harry Rieck ---------- Preston, Md.
Secretary W. H. Rice ---------- College Park, Md.

Hillsboro-Queen Anne Cooperative

President, Edwin Warfield, Jr. ---------- Woodbine, Md.
Manager, Henry Whiteford ---------- Whiteford, Md.

Associated Women of the Maryland Farm Bureau

President, Mrs. C. J. Kern ---------- Denton, Md.
Secretary, Mrs. Randall Spoerlein ---------- New Windsor, Md.

Maryland Nurserymen's Association

President, Daniel B. Stoner ---------- Westminster, Md.
Secretary, Paul Hofman ---------- Towson, Md.

CONTENTS

The Maryland Agricultural Society—The Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.

	Page
Letter of Transmittal	3
Board of Directors	4
Presidents and Secretaries of County Farm Bureaus	5
Officers of Affiliated Associations	7
Farm Bureau Insurance—Zack Turner	12
Activities of Associated Women—Mrs. Edwin D. Fry	16
Annual Report of Joint Tax Committee (Summary)	18–20
Report of Farm Labor Committee—P. C. Turner, Chairman	21
President's Annual Address—R. C. F. Weagly	23
Secretary's Annual Report—C. E. Wise, Jr.	29
The Agricultural Situation Today and Tomorrow—Dr. S. H. DeVault	35
Wars and Aftermaths of Wars—The Vicious Spirals—Dr. S. R. DeVault	44
The Responsibility of Farm People in the War Finance Program—Alex D. Cobb	45
Report of Credentials Committee	49
Winners in Maryland Farm Bureau F. F. A. Contest—H. F. Cotterman	50
The Work of Farm Women—Mrs. Charles Sewell	52
Address—Ben Kilgore	57
Address—Hon. H. Streett Baldwin	62
"A" Award to Worcester County—Brigadier General Philip Hayes	66
Annual Meeting—Maryland Farm Bureau	68
Roll Call of Voting Delegates	68
Report of Treasurer, C. E. Wise, Jr.	69
Audit Committee Report	70
Presentation of Resolutions	70
Election of Officers	73
Directors of Maryland Farm Bureau for 1944	74
Resolutions, 1944 Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.	75
Resolutions of the Associated Women of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.	83
Annual Meeting of Maryland Agricultural Society	84
Directors and Voting Delegates of the Maryland Agricultural Society	84
Treasurer's Report, Maryland Agricultural Society—T. B. Symons	86
Election of Officers, Maryland Agricultural Society	86
Minutes of Annual Meeting of the Associated Women of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.	87
Report of Maryland State Council of 4-H Clubs	90

Maryland State Horticultural Society

President's Address—Stanley M. Fulton	92
Address—Peach Varieties: What's In The Future—A. L. Schrader and I. C. Haut	93
Address—Thinning Fruit With Blossom Sprays—L. P. Batjer	98

CONTENTS—Continued

Page

Address—Activities of National Apple Institute in Relation To Growers' Problems—Carroll R. Miller 100
Address—The 1944 Supply of Fertilizer—F. W. Parker 105
Report of the Secretary-Treasurer—A. F. Vierheller 106
Address—Two Years' Observation on the Causes of "Sick" Peach Trees—I. C. Haut 107
Address—Appalachian Apple Service and National Peach Council Plans for Marketing the 1944 Crop—Carroll R. Miller 114
Address—Keeping Ahead of Mice in the Orchard—John N. Hamlet 119
Address—Fruit Prices and Fruit Profits—Henry W. Miller, Jr. 121
Address—Our Experience With the 1943 Farm Labor Program in Maryland, And Plans For the Coming Year—Paul A. Nystrom 123
Address—The Outlook for Spray Material Supplies for 1944—C. Graham 124
Committee Reports 126
Resolutions 127
Address—The Codling Moth Problem—W. S. Hough 131
Address—The World Fruit Situation and Post-War Problems—Fred A. Motz 134
Discussion—Some Post-War Problems in Fruit Growing in This Eastern Region 142
Address—Apple Variety Adjustments—I. C. Haut 142

Maryland Crop Improvement Association

Address—Quality of Hay and Its Effect on Feeding Value—Dr. K. L. Turk 144
Address—Quality Hay in the Ration of Dairy Cattle—Dr. L. A. Moore 145
Address—Making Quality Hay Every Year—John W. Magruder 148
Address—Forced Ventilation Barn Drying of Hay—W. H. Dickerson, Jr. 149
Discussion—Other Aids to Making Quality Hay 153
Business Meeting 158

Report of Maryland State Beekeepers' Association 159

Maryland Vegetable Growers' Association

Summary of Discussions 160
Officers Elected 164
Winners In Potato and Vegetable Show 165

Maryland Stockmen's Association

Address—New Methods of Controlling Internal Parasites in Livestock—A. O. Foster 169
Address—A. Livestock Conservation Program—Dr. Fred H. Leinbach 174
Address—The Army Meat Program—Major Joseph B. Corns 176
Address—War-Time Meat Problems—Wells E. Hunt 180
Address—The Feed Outlook—K. L. Turk 181
Address—Feed Distribution Problems—C. D. Caskey 184

CONTENTS—Continued

Page

Address—Comparative Value of Substitute Feeds For Livestock—Dr. DeVoe Meade 184
Report of Secretary-Treasurer—James B. Outhouse 188
Board of Directors for 1944 189
Honorary Life Memberships to Dr. Mark Welsh and W. R. Harvey—Dr. Dan E. Wight 190
Address—Post-War Problems—Senator Millard E. Tydings 191

Report of the Maryland Tobacco Growers Association 196

Maryland State Poultry Council

Address—The Outlook for Poultrymen in 1944 Regarding Feed, Fuel Ceiling Prices, Equipment, Etc.—H. L. Shrader 199
Address—Improving Maryland Turkey Breeding Flocks Through The Maryland Turkey Improvement Plan—Frank E. Moore 202
Address—Egg Production Management Problems—H. C. Knandel 205
Address—Meeting Broiler Production Problems in 1944—Prof. Edmund Hoffman 208
Address—Controlling The Three Most Important Poultry Diseases—Dr. H. M. DeVolt 209
Address—Egg and Incubation Factors Affecting Hatchability and Chick Quality—Dr. R. E. Phillips 215
Business Meeting 216
Chairman's Report 217
Secretary's Report 219
Report of Auditing Committee 221
Report of Resolutions Committee 222
Report of Nominating Committee 223
Report of Maryland Nurserymen's Association 224

REPORT

OF THE

TWENTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING

Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.

Lord Baltimore Hotel, Baltimore, Md.

January 13-14, 1944

MR. WEAGLY, President: I am going to call on H. H. Nuttle to lead us in prayer.

MR. NUTTLE: Father in Heaven, we do not presume to conduct this meeting without asking Thy presence with us. We need Thy presence, we need Thy guidance in everything that we do. Father, may we take the longtime view for the farmer in what we do, not thinking of those things that are apparently selfish and short-time, but thinking of the welfare of the world, of the United States, and of our own State. May we ask that Thou wilt give us wisdom, give us understanding, and be in everything that we do, and while we are talking to Thee, we pray Thee to bless our boys and girls in the service, and if it be Thy will, bring them back safe to us. We ask all this in Christ's Name, Amen.

MR. WEAGLY: We will now declare the Twenty-eighth Annual Meeting of the Maryland Farm Bureau in session, and I present your presiding officer for this morning. He comes from one of the Eastern Shore Counties that has made outstanding contributions in the production of crops. Before this Convention is over, you will know what I am referring to. I now present to you Mr. S. O. Northam, of Worcester County.

Mr. NORTHAM: Thank you, Mr. Weagly. When Mr. Weagly wrote me and offered me this delightful privilege of being Chairman of the meeting this morning, I did not think it would amount to so much. There is a long program and we are a little bit late. I will now present to you Mr. Zach Turner whom you all know as our hard-working insurance agent for the State of Maryland.

FARM BUREAU INSURANCE

ZACH TURNER, State Agent

MR. TURNER: It hardly seems possible that one year has passed since I gave my last report of the activities of Farm Bureau Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, Farm Bureau Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and Farm Bureau Life Insurance Company.

The past year was another year of progress in all of these companies, in spite of the difficulties. Not a single representative shirked his or her responsibilities within the area of Maryland, Delaware and District of Columbia, which comes under the supervision of your state office located at Charles and North Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland.

I am proud of the accomplishment of the 133 representatives within the above three states and have a just right to be because these men produced more business in all lines, in all of the above companies, during 1943 than had been produced any year previous.

Our country today needs farmers organized to produce food that will win the war and the peace. Farmers should organize in order to make maximum use of their land, labor and machinery, organizing to promote working relationships with government agencies in an effort to increase food production and eliminate unnecessary government restrictions which interfere with production.

If this (food production) job is to be done right, we must rely on the State, county and community organizations of real people who have built America. Let us accept that challenge!

Farmers should organize to enrich rural living by working together to improve our homes, churches, schools, and neighborhoods. Together we can do this.

Farmers need to be organized to advance political democracy, in support of legislation which advances the farmers' welfare, and they should be 100% organized to give them power in local, state and national governments. They must fight legislation which is unfair to farmers, and make government officials responsive to rural need. United, our voice will be heard.

Then, they must join together to advance economic democracy by helping farmers get a fair share of the national income, through organizing cooperative buying to reduce cost; and organizing cooperative selling to increase income.

All Farm Bureau insurance policies are non-assessable. To save and to serve better are two of the constantly practiced motives of all cooperative effort.

What more enduring and expressive gift can a man give his loved ones than a Farm Bureau Life Insurance policy? It speaks volumes of his

regard and devotion, even when he is but a memory to them. It banishes the fear in every wife's heart when her thoughts go forward to the possible time when she might have to go alone and unaided with perhaps a family to support. It assures the son of a decent start in life. Now is the time to prepare for your family's future security.

Farm Bureau Mutual Fire Insurance: Check your property insurance policies. Be sure you have complete protection against the hazards of fire, windstorm, tornado, hail, explosives, riot, riot attending a strike, aircraft damage, smoke damage, and motor vehicles.

Rent insurance provides protection against rent cost or rent income loss.

Farm Bureau Mutual Automobile Insurance: Carry full coverage protection which includes such benefits as "limited-drive-other-car-coverage" that protects the named insured and spouse while driving any private passenger car not owned by the named insured or his immediate family. Under the theft coverage, theft rental is allowed as specified by the policy.

Here are the reasons why you need farm liability protection: In the event of negligence on the part of yourself or your farm hands, you have responsibility:

1. For accidents caused by your livestock straying upon the highway.
2. For accidents caused by your dog.
3. For accidents caused by the operation of your tractor on the farm and on the highways.
4. For operation of your team on the highway, in town, or another person's farm.
5. For accidents caused by any farm machinery operated on your farm.
6. To people who come on your farm or stop at your roadside stand to buy vegetables, dairy products, poultry, etc.

It is wise to act and let the Farm Bureau Mutual Automobile Insurance Company solve your Workmen's Compensation problems because: It is the fourth largest mutual automobile insurance company in the United States in automobile premium income. It is in excellent financial condition, having assets of $10,238,476.66, liabilities of $6,548,434.27, and surplus of $3,690,042.39, as of December 31, 1942. Its claim service has always followed the motto of "Fair, Frank, Firm". It is affiliated with the Farm Bureau Mutual Fire Insurance Company and the Farm Bureau Life Insurance Company. Together, these three companies have over 500,000 policyholders, and can serve you with the following types of insurance:

1. Workmen's Compensation
2. General Liability
3. Property Fire
4. War Damage
5. Accident and Health
6. Automobile
7. Life

Insure the Cooperative way:

"People are never really helped," says the great Irish sage, George Russell, "except when they are engaged in helping themselves, and those who can bring hope, and the impulse of self-help, are the best reformers of any."

No cooperative service has in it more of that element of self-help opportunity, than does user-controlled insurance and finance.

When you insure this mutual, cooperative way, you pool your insurance funds together with funds of thousands of other policyholders for mutual protection and financial security in case of probable losses. This is, in itself, one of the basic and successful principles of the cooperative program of self-help.

Talk over your insurance needs with your local Farm Bureau Insurance agent:

In the Farm Bureau insurance companies, where cooperative principles are dominant, service is a vital and important part of your Farm Bureau representative's daily work.

It is his responsibility to serve his neighbors' insurance needs, to give counsel and to suggest plans and the most economic method of providing the proper protection for your individual needs.

Any time that you have questions regarding Farm Bureau insurance policies you now have, or other insurance needs, call him for information. Farm Bureau insurance Companies offer a most complete line of insurance including life, fire, general liability, accident and health, burglary and robbery, and passenger car and commercial vehicle protection.

Before you insure, ask your local Farm Bureau representative about these insurance services. You can depend upon sound protection at the most economical cost.

During 1943, the agents in Maryland produced: Life, $1,484,114.00; Auto, 15,481, coverages; Fire $29,921.00; General Liability, $12,432.00; Workmen's Compensation was introduced in August.

The total production in the Tri-State territory during 1943 was: Life, $2,166,142.00; G. L. $14,846.00 premium; Fire, $37,513.00 premium; 20,494 coverages.

The Farm Bureau insurance companies showed a solid growth in 1943. The life company produced better than 23 million dollars of business. This was 15% greater than 1942's production.

The Farm Bureau Mutual Automobile Insurance Company showed increase of 52% over 1942's record—in addition 1,633 accident and health contracts were written—it also showed 80% increase in General Liability coverage with premiums totaling nearly a quarter of a million dollars. Workmen's Compensation Insurance was inaugurated with $67,000 in premium. Property fire insurance showed approximately 47% increase in premiums over 1942, with premiums amounting to well over one-half a million dollars. Farm Bureau Mutual Automobile policyholders—here is good news for you! In spite of the increased costs in labor and parts and poor tires and cars in poor repairs, through economical operation and careful selection of risks, we are offering a further rate reduction on all passenger care premiums of Public Liability and Property damage effective January 1, 1944. These rates are now the lowest they have been in several years.

Our agency force is to be congratulated on its splendid accomplishments and I feel that 1944's record will surpass the past.

I want to thank the agency force for its help and support and also the Farm Bureau state and county directors and their members for their contributions in making 1943's record what it is.

We are fortunate that we are a part of the great cooperative movement which is developing rapidly and soundly during the war period and to which the boys in service may return when the war is over. 1944 will be one year when we shall especially consider the blessings and the privileges of a democracy and a Christian nation. We must dedicate ourselves more earnestly to the ideals of democracy and the teachings of Christianity, so that our nation may continue to stand for true freedom, which is service to mankind rather than domination of mankind.

MR. NORTHAM: Thank you, Mr. Turner, that was very interesting. Our next speaker on the program is a lady who is President of the Associated Women of Maryland, Mrs. Edwin D. Fry needs no introduction.

MRS. FRY: Thank you, Mr. Northam. I am not President of the Associated Women now, Mrs. Clarence Kern is the new President.

REPORT—ASSOCIATED WOMEN

MRS. EDWIN D. FRY

During the five years that I have served as President of Associated Women of the Maryland Farm Bureau, I have grown to know and appreciate the satisfaction that comes from working together with Farm Bureau members and officers to bring about better opportunities for rural living and now that of working together to help end the war and win the peace. I want you to know that I appreciate the loyalty and friendly helpfulness that have been shown me by officers, members of the board of directors and members alike, and feel sure my successor Mrs. Clarence Kern will lead the Associated Women into ever-expanding fields of service, with the same encouragement.

The past year has not been an easy one for any of us. We have helped produce and conserve more food on the farms with less of nearly everything, including workers on the farms and in the homes. We are determined to work today without stint to help win this war as speedily as possible in order to live tomorrow and rear our families united in a stronger America. When state presidents of Associated Women from other states give reports of their activities, there are wide variations according to the relationships with the Extension Service in the various states. In some states, Associated Women are Extension clubwomen or Home Bureaus separate and distinct from Farm Bureau. In others, they are organized as we are in Maryland, because we feel that in addition to being members of Extension Homemaker Clubs, as the majority of us are, as Associated Women of Farm Bureau we are in position to work for an enlarged field of Extension Service and by strengthening Farm Bureau help to solve some of the problems that hinder and constrain a satisfactory way of life for farm families. Each group complements and helps the other.

Because of this set-up in Maryland, Associated Women have stressed membership work in Farm Bureau as one of our important projects and will continue to do so. Assistance in forming and carrying on planning or discussion groups of 10 to 12 farm families in local communities for the purpose of keeping informed and informing our county and state offices as to our views on farm questions of current interest is another project. The recreational phase of these neighborly gatherings is of great value in these days of stress. Plans for more recreational opportunities for rural families will be carried out during the coming year. Contributions were made to United China Relief in the amount of $100., through the national organization of Associated Women and also $5.00 to the Penny for Friendship Fund, another national project.

Program planning, assisting with war bond sales, publicity, encouraging 4--H Club work and victory gardeners were also part of the past year's activities.

We are proud of Mrs. Roy Weagly who was reelected Vice-President of the Associated Women of the A.F.B.F. and is now serving in that capacity for the third year.

1943 was a year of much active service on the part of our then Vice-President, Mrs. Kern, whom you will recall gave a fine report in this meeting a year ago. She presided ably at the 1943 annual state meeting of Associated Women. The latter part of November, Mrs. Kern again represented the Associated Women at a Southern States Cooperative Advisory Planning Conference of leaders of Extension, Farm and Farm Women's organizations held in Richmond, Va.

Mrs. P. D. Brown, Secretary and all directors have been active and helpful in organization work.

During the year, as President, it has been my privilege to serve within the state on Farm Bureau Resolutions, Membership, and Agricultural Budget committees; on the Maryland Victory Garden, Farm War Savings and Agricultural Post-War Planning committees; to address two county annual meetings and to present to five outstanding 4-H club girls at the University of Maryland on November 6th the Maryland Farm Bureau $10 war stamp awards for accomplishment and excellent records. An interesting assignment was that of participating in a panel discussion of representatives of consumer cooperatives, C.I.O., O.P.A., Farmers Union and Farm Bureau on the topic, "Can Farmers and Consumers Get Together?" This Conference of Maryland and D. C. Consumer Cooperatives was held in October at American University in Washington. Quarterly conferences of Presidents and secretaries of the northeastern states were well attended by state leaders of Associated Women, also the Northeastern Farm Bureau Conference held in New York the second week in June. These meetings and the national conventions held in Chicago in December complete the summary of my travels during 1943 as President. During the recent convention in Chicago, the memory of Mrs. Ida B. Knighton, whose passing we mourn, was honored during the memorial service on Tuesday December 7. Mrs. Knighton was for some years Chairman of Associated Women in Anne Arundel County and will long be remembered, by those privileged to have known her, for her courageous vision, sparkling, kindly wit, and poetic gift of expression. Being a participant in panel discussions on both the Saturday meeting of state chairmen of Associated Women and again on Monday in the Youth Conference led up to, what, for me, was one of the highspots of the conventions. I was elected voting delegate to the Thursday meeting of the A.F.B.F. by the Associated Women of the northeastern region and thus had an opportunity to vote on the strong resolutions which you have probably read by now.

Our goal this year is 100% county organization of Associated Women. You are familiar with Hohman's famous painting which pictures

Christ knocking on the door of willingness, which can only be opened from within. There is no latch or handle on the outside. So it is with organization of Associated Women. They can only become organized in counties where there is a desire and willingness on the part of women to assume responsibility and enjoy the privileges of organization and likewise desire and willingness on the part of the county Farm Bureau board of directors to make that possible.

Our task is to protect the farm homes from within and without, using every right means available to us. Farm Bureau stands ready to help us. We will help Farm Bureau.

In the words of J.Herbert Smith, "You and I are America. Unless we change, America will not change. Unless we are willing to experiment boldly with the application of absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness, and absolute love in our relationships and responsibilities America, the land of the free, may lose her freedom because she no longer has the moral and spiritual values to maintain it."

MR. NORTHAM: That is a very fine report, Mrs. Fry. I think the members will do well to consider a lot of the things she said. In some of the Counties, as well as my own, we ought to help get the women's organization started better than it has been.

At this time we have a Tax Committee report by Mr. Wise, our Secretary.

MR. WISE: Mr. Chairman, this tax committee report has been duplicated and you may each obtain a copy by going to Room 356, and asking for it. We would like you to study it, and if you have anything to suggest, we will take it up for discussion tomorrow at our business meeting. I only want now to point out some of the high spots.

The report starts with this sentence:—"Farmers, like others, face heavier taxation during the war emergency, and probably in the post-war period."

Then, the report drops down and hits the high spots in Government Economy. Then it gives figures in the "Trend in State Tax Revenues", pointing out that the total tax collections from important revenue sources amounted to about $50,000,000 in 1942, whereas for the last 12 months they amounted to only $44,600,000.

Details of the Revenue Receipts from important State Taxes in Maryland for the 12-month period are given.

An analysis reveals that in July, 1943, Maryland had a general fund surplus of $12,600,000, which included a working fund of $2,000,000.

On October 29, Gov. O'Conor announced that $1,605,000 of the State surplus would be used to further reduce the State income tax on in-

dividuals in 1944 by cutting the tax rates to one-half of those in 1942. This left a real surplus of about $200,000, in addition to the $2,000,000 working fund.

Then, it takes up Federal Taxation, something we are very much interested in . I want to read this paragraph: "It is the judgment of this Committee that several features of the income tax law, and the rules and regulations affecting farmers, should be modified." It goes on to give the reasons for that statement, and has the following recommendations:

"We recommend that the Victory Tax as now levied be abolished and the equivalent of its rates and other provisions be consolidated with the net income tax."

"We recommend that Federal income tax provisions relative to the dates of filing estimates and final returns be modified."

It suggests that the schedule for farmers should be shortened,—"one special farmers' return form should provide for determining income from the farming business as well as provide for the statements regarding personal tax liability."

It deals with the new development in the real estate property tax in Maryland. It touches on Federal Excise taxes in which we are especially interested.

It has a section with regard to financing education, and recommends that the Board of Public Works give serious consideration to providing additional State funds from available appropriations to augment teachers' salaries after April, 1944.

It then touches on Federal Appropriations for Education, saying that this Committee is opposed to the recent proposal to appropriate Federal money for equalizing education facilities among the states, and giving the reasons why they think so.

As to Post-War Government Projects of Interest to Rural People, it says that farmers are interested in several types of public projects which will assist in the post-war adjustment period. It suggests that most of the counties had accumulated a surplus in their gasoline tax accounts by July 1, 1943, and urges that farm groups should take an interest in proposing projects which will add to the public benefit and safety.

That is only a very brief analysis of the report, and copies are available if you will call at Room 356. I wish each member would get one and study it so that we may take it up at our business meeting tomorrow.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE JOINT TAX COMMITTEE OF THE MARYLAND FARM BUREAU, INC., AND MARYLAND STATE GRANGE

(A Digest)

Farmers are faced with heavier taxation in the post-war period. This is especially true regarding Federal taxes, whereas not much change in local farm real estate taxes have occurred during the past six years.

The Committee stressed the need for economy in all units of government. Agencies whose useful purpose has terminated should be abolished.

Studies in the trend of state taxes show a decrease in revenue from gasoline tax, alcoholic beverage taxes, and state property taxes. Total state tax revenues from the important sources in 1943 amounted to $44,600,000, as compared with nearly $50,000,000 in 1942.

The state general fund surplus was about $200,000 as of July 1, 1943, after deducting all emergency appropriated funds and a working fund of $2,000,000. There are other surplus funds in the county and state roads accounts, as well as in the annuity bond fund.

Federal income taxation as it applies to farmers was criticized mainly on two grounds. First, the Victory Tax exemption tends to produce discrimination against the farmers' wives. Second, the income tax exemption and procedure are too complex. Different amounts of exemptions apply for Victory Tax and normal tax purposes. Requiring farmers to file an estimated return one month prior to the time when they could make a final return seems unnecessary.

It was recommended that the Victory Tax be abolished as a separate tax. Furthermore, it was recommended that Federal Income Tax procedure applicable to farmers be simplified, and that farm return blanks be shortened.

A Federal sales tax for the duration of the war emergency was approved by the Committee. Such a tax should be so defined that farmers would not be subject to a sales tax on items used in production.

After January 1, 1944, all counties will have permanent and full-time assessors, or assessing boards. The number of assessors varies from one each in six counties to six or more in two counties. Local assessors are appointed by the County Commissioners from a list of applicants whose qualifications have been graded by the State Tax Commission. Approximately one-fifth of each county will be assessed each year.

The acute problem of maintaining an adequate staff in the public schools hinges largely upon supplemental compensation after the present bonus expires in May, 1944. If such a promise of salary increases is not made, we might expect large scale movement of teachers to other positions.

The Committee registered its disapproval of the recently introduced bill in Congress to appropriate Federal funds for equalizing educational facilities among the states.

Governmental post-war projects suggested as feasible are as follows:

1. County highway improvements.
2. County Court House improvements.
3. Wholesale produce market in Baltimore City.
4. Various local projects, such as erosion control, forest conservation, and drainage.

MR. NORTHAM: Our next speaker is a man whom we all know as a former president of the Maryland Farm Bureau, now president of the Inter-State Farmers' Council, and he has a nice speech for us on the "Labor Committee". Mr. P. C. Turner.

REPORT OF FARM LABOR COMMITTEE

P. C. TURNER—Chairman

If some one were writing a history of this war to date, he would say that our boys on foreign battle fronts are living up to the best American traditions.

He would say that industry is turning out an endless stream of war equipment at cost plus.

He would say that labor by strikes and threats of strikes are forcing a never-ending increase in wages, thereby creating a buying power that spells inflation.

He would say that the farmer and his family are working long arduous hours growing food so necessary to win this war. He gets no time and a half for overtime or double time for holidays. He gambles for remuneration for his efforts on the hap-hazard prices set by the O.P.A. for his products. He cannot compete with industry for labor. The importance of the food problem was recognized by the powers that be in Washington only after industry had drawn off the cream of the skilled farm labor.

The historian would say the Maryland Farm Bureau foresaw the coming storm a year prior to Pearl Harbor and asked Dr. S. H. DeVault, that wizard of economics, to survey the labor situation. Dr. DeVault is secretary to the State Farm Labor Committee and is always ready to furnish facts and figures as to labor needs.

A Labor Committee was set up back in Land-Use days. Then came the Selective Service law. Our State and County Committees were recognized by the Selective Service as investigators for them on farm labor registrants. The War Board in Maryland made us sub-committees

of the War Board. We want to give credit to the Selective Service, both at the State and County level, for their sympathetic understanding of the need for food and of the farmer's plight. There have been 15,000 farm deferments out of a total of 45,000 occupational deferments in the State, or 33 1/3% of the total. This means a deferment for only one out of every three farms. The Tydings Amendment to the Teen-Age Draft Bill on farm deferments meant a lot in getting these results.

The historian would say that on May 1, 1943 the problem of farm labor procurement was dumped into the lap of our Maryland Extension Forces. Dr. Symons placed this responsibility in the capable hands of Paul Nystrom. With this leadership, our County Agents came through in an astonishing manner, with the result that practically all crops were harvested and processed.

The farm labor problem presents a challenge to us all in 1944.

We know that seasonable growing weather will mean a lot more labor needed.

Your officers are backing the A.F.B.F. and the National Extension Forces in securing the passage of House Resolution 208, which would provide adequate funds and would place entire responsibility with the Extension Service for the farm labor program, including recruitment and placement of all farm labor and the operation of all farm labor camps.

A farm labor resolution, with an eleven-point program, will be submitted by the Resolutions Committee to your Delegate body on Friday. For the State Farm Labor Committee I want to express appreciation to the devoted men and women who so gloriously cooperated in seeing to it that practically all crops were saved in 1943.

Every farm organization, every government agency, every school, every civic club, every 4-H club, every F.F.A. and every citizen of Maryland, we know will rally behind the Extension Forces to the end that no food for victory will be lost in 1944.

MR. NORTHAM: Thank you for your report, Mr. Turner.

Our next speaker is the President of our Maryland State Farm Bureau. He is a man who has been working with the Farm Bureau for a great many years, and he has a full knowledge of what the possibilities are and also what has been accomplished up to this time. We will now call on our President, Mr. R. C. F. Weagly, for his President's address.

ANNUAL ADDRESS

R. C. F. WEAGLY, President

It is needless for me to say that we are still at war with Germany, Japan and, as farmers, with certain individuals at Washington, D. C.

The American farmer is now engaged in the greatest task ever undertaken in the history of the world. The demands upon the farm family, imposed by global warfare, are beyond one's imagination. Feeding our own 132 million American mouths, under adverse conditions, has been no easy task. But today the American farmer's responsibility is more than doubled.

Bereft of his help on the farm and denied sufficient farm machinery, repair and replacement, the farmer goes about his task without fanfare. His is a silent job which history may well record as a miracle of achievement.

The word that spells the recipe of his success is a magic, yet to some groups a very unpopular one—a word well-known to all thrifty farm families. It is the simple word, WORK. Farm people like to work and we like to work together. It is the greatest joy of life. The right to work and the will to do so is the only formula for social security, for progress and for prosperity.

Two generations ago farm people represented nearly 80% of the population of the United States. Our parents can remember when only 40% of our population lived on the land. Today we find that only 20% of our population live on farms. Thus, the percentage of farmers to the total population has been diminishing every generation by approximately one-half. And yet, only about 20% of the 20% belong to a major farm organization.

When we take into consideration the facts that industry is 85% organized, labor is 75% organized and agriculture is only about 20% organized, we can readily understand why the impact of the pressure of other organized groups upon agriculture is so intense. Whether or not that pressure be brought about by design or out of hostility, it is, nevertheless, a threat to agriculture; and the only way to promote, protect and preserve American agriculture is for farm people to join themselves together to form organizations as strong, proportionately, as other groups.

In view of these facts, it is our belief that farmers, as never before, are beginning to realize the need for a strong organization. Even though they are more ready to join than ever before, it is well to let them know that they are wanted and needed to march along together in Farm Bureau. There is no finer privilege which one family can ask of another than that they march along together for service, for progress and for accomplishment.

Now is the time when all people—all groups and all agencies in this country should be united and working together for a common cause—that of winning the war and keeping America the free, democratic country our fore-fathers planned it to be.

Agriculture, industry and labor will have to learn to live together within their own groups; they will also have to learn to cooperate with each other. There is no such thing as an agricultural problem being limited to the country districts, alone. Whatever affects agriculture vitally affects the welfare of all other groups, and all individuals.

If the war has taught us any one thing, it is the value of coordinated effort and the value of giving support to the cooperative program of our people, despite the fact that forces are at work trying to destroy the cooperative movement; scheming to block individual initiative; and definitely planning to limit the capacity of farmers in the management of their own business.

All progress that has been made agriculturally in this country has been made through the united efforts of the farmers themselves. Although progress has been greatly retarded by directives, regulations, and red tape, we must not allow ourselves to become too discouraged because we do have a wealth of able and courageous leaders among both farm men and farm women who will testify that American farmers want to remain free—free to run their own business in their own way and without needless interference!

We realize that during a total war many privileges must be curtailed, and powers delegated to those in authority, but we do insist that when the war ceases these powers and privileges be returned to the people. In other words, this surrender of our liberties is strictly temporary, and we serve notice that after the war is over, the right to govern must revert to the people. There is where it belongs and there is where it has to be, permanently!

We certainly do not propose that, in fighting for the freedom of all the rest of the world, we are going to lose our own. American democracy must gird herself and be strong enough to hold her own both during the conflict and also against every wave of post-war reaction, else we shall lose everything for which we are fighting, except national survival.

Let us hope for the New Year that every Farm Bureau member will stand squarely on his own feet, with chin up ready to face facts, and with eyes looking beyond tomorrow, so that we cannot help but march triumphantly forward toward our great goal, EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE.

Because farming in Maryland is so diversified may be the reason why city people have divers opinions about us and our problems. City

consumers are just now beginning to realize that before food can be taken out of the can it must be grown and put there.

So many people, including editors, politicians, business leaders, labor leaders, housewives, government officials, and economists take flings at the farmer, grossly misrepresenting the farmer's aims, his financial condition, and the war profits he is supposed to be making.

This appears to be a part of a planned campaign against the farmer, to make the public think that the farmer is greedy and that he is already getting more than his fair share of the national income; which, of course, is not true. But the farmer is easy prey because his problems are not understood by the public at large; and because the farmer is so busy making a living and producing food for others—including the howlers, that he does not take the time to answer back.

I think it is about time for the farmer to realize that we cannot overcome evil by simply ignoring it. We must speak for Agriculture. The farmer's voice must be heard; and his judgment must be revealed in all policy-making conferences of our country.

It is gratifying that through the Extension Service all rural groups in Maryland are being asked to cooperate in developing a post-war program.

When our boys come home victorious, we shall owe them a great deal more than parade and applause. We shall owe them opportunities for work; opportunities for getting ahead; and a freedom to climb just as high as their own ability will take them. We shall owe them a free America, worthy of their sacrifices.

The consuming public of America has been living at the expense of farmers for such a long time that when farm commodities drew near parity level it seemed difficult for a large percentage of the consuming public as well as those in administrative position, to comprehend the situation.

It is the belief of Farm Bureau leaders that the system of consumer subsidies is more inflationary than the system of pay-as-you-go. Subsidy advocates have conducted an organized "Scare" campaign designed to frighten the public into believing that the only alternative to consumer subsidy is run-away food prices and wild inflation. They have spread a vast amount of misleading propaganda containing absurd and fantastic claims as to the increase in food costs if subsidies are eliminated. The elimination of consumer subsidies will not cause inflation.

There are various reasons why we should not subsidize the grocery bill.

1. National income is at an all-time high;

2. If the Federal treasury pays for a portion of the food bill, it will mean just that much more money in the hands of the consumer with which to bid for already scarce items and will lead to increased inflation;

3. A subsidy program will cost in interest and administration and, in the long run, all of us will be taxed to pay for it; and once a hand goes down into the Federal treasury it is difficult to get it out. Whoever pays the fiddler, dictates the type of music to which we dance.

4. Labor spends for food the lowest percentage of income ever recorded in the history of the nation, but he still demands increased wages and cheaper food.

There is no point in being against subsidies unless we have a suggestion which we think is better. We already have the Price Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, passed by Congress and signed by the President. The Act directed the President to stabilize both prices and wages as nearly as practicable, at the levels of September 15, 1942. Congress did not intend to freeze all prices or all wages, but specifically directed that the prices of agricultural commodities and products thereof shall be adjusted sufficiently to offset farmers' increased labor and other costs and to secure the necessary production. It also authorized the adjustment of inequitable or sub-standard wages.

If these price adjustments were made as directed by Congress, no consumer subsidies would be required and both prices and wages could be stabilized on an equitable basis.

Instead, the leaders of organized labor, supported by the Administration, have demanded that food prices be rolled back to September, 1942 levels and frozen, while at the same time they are demanding flexible wages.

The real issue is whether consumers are going to pay the entire cost of their food today or expect the Government to pay part of their food bill out of borrowed funds to be passed on to our returning soldiers and to future generations.

Our united voice now for the right will not only help us to overcome difficulties in the present, but will also add to our strength in the future. Farm leaders through our organization are earnestly endeavoring to create an understanding of world citizenship among farm people.

When our young men and young women come home again, they will think of the world as they know it really is—a clustering of nations whose individual welfare, in the peace to come, will depend upon the welfare of them all.

Our National Farm Bureau president, Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, in his annual address, at Chicago last month, said in part: "I have great confidence in the common sense of farm people, and I believe that if farm people can have a voice in working out some of the international problems, the world will be better off. I hope to see the day when representatives of farm people, elected by the people and not appointed by the government, will get together at regular intervals to consider their mutual problems and to work them out in fairness and justice to all. To be quite frank, I believe that the farm people of the world, working in this way, could do more to preserve world peace than could any other group or agency".

We have been told that the more money you have the more trouble you have. We all agree that we now have more trouble and more money than we had in the dark days around 1932, when the results of the Triple-A were what kept farmers farming.

The basic factors of that program were: Commodity Loans, Crop Adjustments, Price Stabilization and Soil Conservation.

Now, when we have full production, normal demands for those products would bring about price stabilization.

I shall repeat the following paragraph from my talk given before the Frederick Kiwanis Club, last August 3rd: Through administrative—not legislative—action, farmers are being deprived of the opportunity of obtaining parity prices when the natural balance of supply and demand would make them available. So, we see that the machinery which was designed to enable farmers to obtain the goal of parity prices is now being used to prevent them from achieving that end.

However, since there is a direct relationship between the quality of the soil, the quality of the people living thereon, and the quality of the institutions which they create, the conservation of our soil is of paramount importance and should be the chief function of the Triple-A at this time.

At our National meeting in Chicago last month, I was deeply impressed by the significance of the fact that leaders from all regions of our nation were in unison, planning policies that will best serve agriculture.

When we met here last year, the General Assembly was in session. No doubt, you will remember that you gave me, through resolutions and Board action, specific instructions, among which was to contact Governor O'Conor and request the reason for his failure to appoint the two members to give farmers fair representation on the Board that functions as the State Board of Agriculture, in accordance with State Law enacted in the General Assembly in 1941. After conferring with Mr. Wise as to the procedure we should take, I wrote Governor O'Conor on Feb-

ruary 17th, asking for an appointment and telling him what we wished to discuss. He gave us an appointment on Washington's Birthday, and on February 24th he notified us that he had selected Mr. H. H. Nuttle of Denton, who is our national director on the A.F.B.F. Board. Our legislative program speaks for itself.

It has been a pleasure to work with you leaders of the 23 County Farm Bureaus and the Associated Women of the Maryland Farm Bureau. I deeply appreciate your cooperation in giving Maryland an all-time high record of 6,339 Farm Bureau families.

I am sure Mr. Wise will give you a detailed report of the activities of the Maryland Farm Bureau.

I deeply appreciate the guidance and help I have received from our Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Wise, and the close cooperation of the two Fieldmen, Martin Sutton and Wilbert Smith. If you think they have a 40-hour week just travel with them.

Our Fieldmen were especially busy while assembling the 140,000 lbs. of wool. This past year, our connection with the United Wool Growers' Association was the most satisfactory one during my affiliation with the Wool Pool.

We are very fortunate to have in the office the efficient help of Miss Dressel and Miss Meyers, who manifest a disposition to please.

Dr. Symons, the Extension Service, and the specialists at the University of Maryland, along with Master T. Roy Brookes of the Grange, have been very helpful.

Mr. Turner, Dr. DeVault, and Paul Nystrom have taken care of the labor situation in a very satisfactory manner and have been very cooperative.

I appreciate the honor of being your president. It is the highest honor that a group of rural people can confer upon one of their members. Along with the honor came an obligation and an opportunity. An obligation to cooperate with other organizations, and an opportunity to serve.

I know that my service has not been perfect, but it was the best I could do. The late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "We cannot live our dreams. We are lucky enough if we can give but a sample of our best, if in our hearts we can feel that it has been nobly done."

MR. NORTHAM: Thank you, Mr. Weagly, for the talk you have just given. We are going to push on, and I will now ask our Secretary, Mr. C. E. Wise, for his report.

SECRETARY'S ANNUAL REPORT

C. E. Wise, Jr., Secretary-Treasurer

While we meet here today, there are over 1400 members of Farm Bureau families in the armed services of the United States or nearly one from every four of our 6,339 member families. This is the largest all-time enrollment in our organization. These farm sons and daughters are on the far-flung battle fronts fighting for us, and with us, to preserve liberty and freedom of enterprise. They have entrusted the home front to us and are out there battling as Americans have never fought before. They are confident that we will carry on.

During 1943 we have carried on, in spite of many handicaps, to maintain the production of food in Maryland. This was accomplished by working harder than ever to offset shortages of labor, supplies and equipment, and to overcome a surplus of regulations. You members found time to support Farm Bureau as it never was supported before and you have helped to accomplish much that will aid in doing our part in this war economy.

Every effort, meeting, and function, of our organization has been planned and used to further the "food for freedom" program. There is, for instance, the legislative program at the 1943 session of the General Assembly, where 1,400 bills were introduced and 1,000 passed. Among the measures initiated by Farm Bureau were: the perishable products bill (vetoed) aimed to prevent the stoppage of products to consumers; the prison farm labor bill to permit release of prisoners on parole and under guard for farm work; the county levy bill to permit county commissioners to levy and appropriate funds for a farm labor program; the 14 and 15-year-old drivers' license bill to permit the issuance of special licenses to these persons; the Baltimore produce market commission to require a study and recommendations to improve the Baltimore produce market facilities; the $1.00 farm truck license; and the work or fight acts which speak for themselves.

The farm organization tax program of luxury commodity taxes plus an income tax was continued, but at a lower rate and the real estate levy was again reduced, making the total reduction 6¢ per $100 of assessment. The state real estate levy is definitely on the way out, due to the farm program, but this project needs our continued strong support if it is not to be sidetracked. These laws make an impressive program when added to the many laws passed in former sessions, among which are the gas tax refund, the R.E.A. bill, the soil conservation act, and the defeat of measures harmful to agriculture. You see what can be done by a relatively few and can visualize the possibilities of a stronger organization.

Martin Sutton and Wilbert Smith did their usual fine work in membership and outdid themselves in the handling of 140,000 pounds of

wool through the pool for a 50% increase in volume. Growers were paid 54¢ for clear wool, which is some 5¢ above local prices. The wool was sold directly to the Government, thereby insuring its use when needed by the country.

The entire Executive Committee attended the Washington meeting on drought relief and urged government assistance to help maintain production in this emergency. President Weagly was made a member of the regional committee and worked effectively and diligently on this, as he has on all projects, to help Maryland farmers.

When the U. S. Treasury requested assistance in the presentation of the Government finance program to farmers, a meeting of farm leaders was called. A state farm war finance committee was formed and your president was elected vice-chairman and your secretary-treasurer made secretary of this group. The counties have cooperated in this program and will be asked to do more in the 4th Loan Drive that starts January 18. For this work the four-point program of "produce all you can, pay your debts, do not speculate but buy war bonds", was pushed. Here is a double-action plan to help our country now and ourselves later. It is definitely a part of future planning and every additional person who adopts it adds security to the period ahead.

As always, our old friends in the Extension Service, headed by Dr. Symons, have worked ceaselessly for our benefit. They have come through on every task assigned to them, notably the farm labor problem. No department in the Federal Government wanted this assignment, so it was given to Extension and they succeeded, as Mr. P. C. Turner, the able Chairman of the Farm Bureau Labor Committee, has told you.

In the fall, a most worthy move for post-war planning for agriculture in this state was started by the Extension Service and farm organization leaders. This is a forward step and will require the cooperation of all.

Soil Conservation deserves a prominent place in any long-time program. During the past month, four meetings have been held in a move to make all citizens conservation conscious. The idea is to have a Conservation Forum in Baltimore attended by farmers, business men, workers, and all classes of citizens to show them the true meaning and importance of conservation. Your officers are taking a leading part in this move to secure future backing for the conservation programs.

During 1943, many worthwhile projects have been sponsored or undertaken by our county units to benefit their members. Some 12 Frozen Food Locker plants are under way in the planning or the construction stage. Difficulty in securing W.P.B. approval has retarded this development, which is by far the most popular new project considered by the

groups this year. Frozen Food Locker construction promises to be one of the major projects in Maryland communities when materials are available and the restrictions are removed.

By December 22, sixteen of our County Farm Bureaus had secured Blue Cross Hospitalization insurance for their members. There are now 845 families and 2,131 individuals enrolled in this service and we begin to approach 100% hospitalization service for our members.

In August, Caroline County started a feed mixing service to supply its members and nearby cooperatives with needed feeds. Under the direction of Martin Sutton, this activity has been of much benefit to farmers throughout the section and has helped maintain dairy and poultry production. Local cooperatives in Frederick, Carroll, Kent, Anne Arundel and Washington Counties have performed similar services. The business volume of these co-ops. is growing rapidly and they are using this opportunity to strengthen their financial structure. Cooperatives are being attacked by a business group recently organized in Chicago. The Farm Bureau in state and nation started the cooperatives with legislative and financial support and they will continue to fight for them.

The foregoing are a few of the highlights of the past year which have taught us a great deal. As we learn how bureaus govern with delegated power, we become more convinced that the government must soon be brought back to the people. Such agencies as OPA, ODT and WPB, which may be necessary in war, must be liquidated as soon as possible when peace comes. Every barrier to the free flow of goods should be removed to give our economic system the flexibility that the law of supply and demand alone can provide.

Bureaus and bureaucrats make hard work harder and necessitate advance planning that encourages hoarding. We not only have to figure where the money is coming from, but we have to plan for longer financing and then find and get materials well ahead of the time needed. Dealers advise the early purchase of seeds, fertilizers and insecticides. Farmers have learned that the gasoline supply can be short and from their experience last spring they appreciate a well-filled storage tank on the farm. Now is a good time to fill that tank and keep it filled. The 1944 farm equipment allotment of steel is 80% of 1940 for new machines and it is unlimited for repair parts, thanks to the efforts of farm organizations—these efforts must not be relaxed.

Farm trucks are wearing out, as are the commercial trucks that haul farm products and supplies. Both will need replacements soon. This situation must be brought to the attention of the WPB and steps taken to fill this need to insure continued distribution of food. There are some idle government trucks and battle scarred jeeps that could be diverted to agriculture prior to the time new ones can be made. Much of the

surplus war material can be used effectively in agriculture and plans should be made to secure and utilize this equipment.

Farm labor will continue to be a worry, at least through the early part of this year. When the war with Germany ends, this problem may ease to some extent. The drought camouflaged the labor problem in 1943, as there was less crop work and more work days than in a normal year. We will get along if the Extension Service is allowed to manage this program in Maryland. Feed is the biggest problem on the farm now and will be for the next few months. This situation has been aggravated some by the drought, but actually caused by the stupid corn-hog price policy. The corn-hog ratio is the best known and understood farm price relation in Agriculture. (Normally the cost of 11 bus. of corn equals the price of 100 lbs. of hogs). The price of corn was fixed at $1.07 a bu. and hogs were $16.00, or an assured net return to the hog feeder of $4.00 to $5.00 per 100 lbs. of hog—this means around $1.50 per bushel for the corn when marketed through hogs. The hogs got the corn and the Eastern dairymen and poultrymen went without it. Other grain prices rose to equivalent of $1.50 corn, so feeds were up to corn in price and the supply of them was depleted. At present the excessive supply of hogs stimulated by this ratio is flooding the markets and many hogs have to be kept on the farms to eat more corn while waiting to be marketed at a lower price, all of which does nobody any good. The refusal of officials to adjust the ratio in time has needlessly dislocated the hog, dairy, and poultry industries. The belated increase of 9¢ per bu. on corn was not enough to do the job, but the old law of supply is starting to work and with the application of a little common sense it may solve the problem.

This ridiculous situation combined with the refusal of the OPA two years ago to grant an increase of 2¢ per quart for milk has nearly ruined Maryland dairymen. An increase of 2¢ per quart would have meant less than $2.00 per year per family in Baltimore. It would have prevented the semi-rationing of milk now in effect and saved the money now being spent in milk subsidies. Thus, the inflexible system of arbitrary price control brought about a milk subsidy that should have been unnecessary. It looks as if a deliberate plan is afoot to force the use of subsidies making producers dependent on the government, thereby building more bureaucracy.

We still oppose subsidies as costly, bureaucratic, and ineffective. All that farmers in this section asked when prices were fixed was a fair price. Milk has sold at the same price for years. This was pointed to and the need for an increase of 2¢ per quart stressed. After a two-year struggle, dairymen got a subsidy instead.

The consumer would pay only 16% of his income for the food he eats today as compared to 34% in 1919 if he ate the same diet; as it is, he pays only 21% or an all-time low and eats better. It is true there are

some whose income is the same or lower, but a plan similar to the food stamp plan could be worked out to meet the situation.

An ample supply of food is the best assurance the consumer has against high prices or inflation. A fair price will do more to assure this production than any artificial stimulants. Stimulants wear off, but a vigorous demand creates a natural price and a healthy flow of products results.

Farmers have increased production all along the line and have not asked premium prices, assurances of profits, nor guarantees against losses for their increased output of normal crops and products. Perhaps egg producers think they should have. Only for commodities where the government has specifically requested increased production have farmers asked some assurance against losses which might be caused by severe price declines. Farmers have proceeded in good faith to grow the products requested after price commitments or assurances from the government of support prices were given. In many instances at harvest or market time farmers have discovered that the government agency had changed the rules so that the price return resulted in a loss. Each broken contract has created uncertainty and will be reflected in reduced production of vitally needed food. To insure the production required, the government should carry out its announced intentions to support prices as promised. Industry knows what it is to receive for its goods. So do the English farmers who are advised a year ahead what their crops will bring. The Maryland farmer does not ask this on all crops, but only on those special crops or products he is urged to produce in excess. Plans for special crops should be made well in advance of the planting season and thereafter lived up to by the government.

Some of this discussion of our current problems may sound too critical, though it is meant as constructive criticism. Today errors cannot be corrected in the usual way, so one must be overly severe and even then may not succeed in time to do much good.

Similar criticisms are directed at the Farm Program usually called the Triple A. Careful investigation reveals that such criticism is generally caused by methods of administration and application rather than the fundamentals of the program. This program is the result of the public recognition that agriculture needs a national policy similar to the tariff. The AAA includes provisions for crop adjustment, for marketing quotas, for crop loans, for soil conservation and for research in industrial uses of farm crops, and represents years of work by organized farmers. If the act needs changes, the farmers themselves should do the job and amend it to suit the needs of agriculture. After that, they should run the program and not be rubber stamps for Washington theorists.

The Farm Credit Administration, which was the farmers' friend in time of need, has recently been criticized by groups outside of agriculture. Here again, is a program we need and, if any changes are to be made, they must be made by farmers and friends of agriculture.

The Farm Bureau was created to meet conditions following World War I. It has developed cooperatives to assist farmers in the distribution of their products and the purchase of supplies. It has virtually written and passed a national program for agriculture and it has helped to create a specialized, well-rounded finance system to serve agriculture. These are part of the foundation we have built in the past. They must be protected and perfected for the future work of rebuilding our economy. That is our first job in the years ahead and it can be accomplished best by securing the help and counsel of all.

The individuals in a community make that community and it is here that future planning must start. Our planning groups have been meeting for five years and have done much to develop the members by broadening their knowledge, and their community by adding new services. Every farmer in Maryland should have the opportunity to work with one of these groups which ought to number 1,000 instead of only 100. The combined judgment of these groups, carried through to the county, the state and the nation, will build a program suited to the local needs and conditions in the respective unit.

These groups lead to a better understanding of the problems and understanding breeds confidence and harmony. One of the common suggestions from these in the past year, has been to point out the need for a better insight into the farmers' problem by urban and city dwellers. This is a move to create unity and harmony among all groups and one of the most important tasks faced by this nation.

Our farmers boil when they read statements in the press that border on baldfaced lies about agricultural income. One statement sent out recently by a U.S.D.A. agency stated that Maryland farm prices were 217% of parity. To one who knows, this is an absolute mis-statement—if true the price control act and the hold the line order are violated by 100%. Investigation showed that the article meant 217% of the parity base period price. Parity and base prices are so little understood that this correction did or would not alter the meaning of the item which appeared to be a deliberate attempt to give a false impression of facts on farmers' income. Many similar instances can be cited that indicate even those supposedly working for farmers and the public do not state the facts fairly, but are propagandists to put over this or that program which the authorities deem expedient.

The American Farm Bureau has established a department of Public Relations and will give true facts on the farm situation. Farmers should also study the other fellow's problem. The country needs a

strong, vigorous, well-informed farm organization to help it build national unity.

In our national organization we have learned to solve problems between competing groups of farmers. The recent national convention demonstrated to the 60 Marylanders attending that farmers can work together and smooth out differences. If the same is done with other groups, a better feeling will result.

Understanding will give us added strength in the period of reconversion to peaceful production. Our problems today are small compared to those involved in reconstruction of our economy after the dislocation of war. Farmers must have a voice in the nation's councils and they must urge a policy of a larger abundance better distributed through the adaptation of war production methods to supply consumer needs. Its fulfillment will materially assist in the perpetuation of peace. Farmers can help their country by building an organization strong enough to make their voice heard when future plans are made.

Our membership goal is 8,000, or more, in 1944. Goals are set to be broken and we will smash this one. It is part of our home front obligation to those fighting in foreign lands.

When those boys and girls come back we can say we have done our best in producing food for freedom. We have built a strong organization to preserve liberty and freedom of enterprise.

We have carried on—

MR. NORTHAM: I think after listening to such a report we can see that our State organization is on the alert and doing all it can to keep up the good work from the Counties.

The next speaker is a man who is the head of the Department of Agricultural Economics at the University of Maryland, and a man for whom all the farmers in Maryland have the highest respect. Dr. S. H. DeVault.

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION TODAY AND TOMORROW

DR. S. H. DEVAULT

The agricultural outlook is closely tied to the war effort and the economic effects of the war in the period of post-war readjustment. Wars affect business and agriculture both directly and indirectly. Wars are always accompanied by temporary prosperity. They lead to high levels of industrial activity, increase the demand for raw materials and finished products, increase employment and consumer purchasing power, increase prices of agricultural and industrial products, increase both taxes and Federal debt, and are accompanied by full employment and high wages.

War Debt

World War I cost this government about $30,000,000,000. In World War II, Congress has already authorized $280,000,000,000 in direct war expenditure of which 144 billions has been spent, and $60,000,000,000 for lend-lease, of which $14,000,000,000 already has been spent.

The present war is costing about 10 times as much in terms of direct outlays by the United States for its own military effort. A national debt of $26,000,000,000 after the last war readily can become a debt of $250,000,000,000 after this war.

The dollars that measure the cost of financing wars also measure the size of taxes that must be levied to help meet that cost. Taxes are already high and will continue to be high for many years following this war.

Furthermore, in the post-war period there will be great quantities of goods and materials in the United States—some estimates run as high as $50,000,000,000—which will be a drug on the market unless exported. The world may draw heavily on the United States, maybe through lend-lease, to build up its industry after the war ends.

All in all, war costs are something that the American people need to think about. The costs of this war are staggering. They will be paid by the present generation, including the soldiers when they return from war, and the future generations. The public debt now stands at $174,000,000,000, and is estimated at $230,000,000,000 by the end of 1944. We cannot ignore this debt now or in the future. The interest on the debt is $3,500,000,000 annually. How the debt will be paid, or in what kind of dollars it will be paid, I cannot foresee.

Inflation

Inflation has already occurred. It is true that the cost of living has not risen alarmingly, but the real factors that cause inflation have largely gone unchecked, and the accumulated pressure from these factors is sure to cause further trouble unless relieved.

There are two chief causes of inflation. One is huge government expenditures coupled with debt. This is the real cause of, or the forerunner of, inflation.

The huge borrowing program of the Federal Government is inflationary. The money borrowed, to be paid back in future years is spent now. This money is paid out in high wages, high prices in raw materials for use in industrial plants. This boosts prices of finished goods, national income and gives us a feeling of temporary prosperity. Any individual or any nation can momentarily be prosperious by borrowing on the future to spend in the present. This is a deceptive and fictitious

prosperity and may result in economic chaos unless we have wise leadership and sound planning in the post-war era.

That part of the cost of the war that is financed by some form of Government credit or borrowing is an inflationary force. Furthermore, it does not make any difference insofar as the inflationary effect is concerned, whether the Government uses the money to pay for building tanks, for building airplanes, to pay the soldiers, to feed and clothe the soldiers, to pay the unemployed to dig ditches, or to pay for subsidies or incentive payments. It is inflationary just the same.

The second cause of inflation rises from a surplus income and a shortage of consumer goods. When the supply of consumer goods is less than the demand, people with surplus spending power begin to bid up the price. As prices rise, costs rise, and if unchecked, we get into a price inflationary spiral. We are at that stage now.

Total national income for 1943 is estimated at $142,000,000,000 and for the fiscal year, 1944, at $152,000,000,000. The amount of available consumer goods and services for the next fiscal year will be about $92,000,000,000. Personal taxes are estimated at $24,000,000,000, leaving an excess spending power of $36,000,000,000. This is dynamite money.

Since the start of World War II, the inflationary force in this country has been tremendous. The national income is currently running at an annual rate of $145 billion, which is more than double the 1939 income of $71 billion. Food in terms of income is the lowest on record. The amount spent for food in 1943 amounting to only 19% of consumers' income.

There are three methods by which inflation could be prevented: (1) produce more civilian goods; (2) reduce peoples' incomes: (3) take part of peoples' income away from them.

The real cure for inflation is to bring supply and demand into balance, and thereby close the inflationary gap. The gap must be closed from both ends. First, we must do all we can to increase the supply. If the supply cannot be increased in some instances to meet the demand, then the demand must be reduced to fit the supply. This can be done through rationing and by curtailing purchasing power through taxation or a practical savings plan.

Parity

The statement is made frequently that farm prices in general are substantially above parity. This is true, when measured in terms of the present parity formula. However, farm labor constitutes one-third of the farmer's operating costs, and labor is omitted from the parity index. Farm wage rates have gone up far faster than other

farm costs. Actually, they have gone up 180% since the 1910-14 base period, the farm wage index standing at 280 today as compared with 100 for the years 1910-1914. Farm wage rates have increased 123% since October, 1939. This cost cannot be ignored if farmers are to increase or maintain production.

If the cost of labor is included, farm prices today are 6 points or 3.0% below parity, the index of prices received standing at 192 as compared with 198 for the things farmers buy, including farm wages. Actually farm prices would be 97.0% of parity.

We need a new parity formula which will do full justice to industry, to labor, and to agriculture. When the war ends, if prices are permitted to drop to levels comparable with those following the last war, we will be headed for a collapse far worse than the depression days of the 1930's. Some standard of fair prices must be set up and maintained. Such standard should be real parity. Then, a floor under commodity prices should be maintained at parity to prevent a collapse.

Farmers should receive real parity income, which is income from farming that will give farm families the opportunity to maintain a level of living on the farm equivalent to that enjoyed by persons living in towns and engaged in other occupations. The parity price index based upon 1910-14 prices has been useful in pointing out the great disparities in the past between what farmers received and what they paid for commodities and services, but it has not been as accurate a measure of income disparity as is desirable. The real goal for farm families and for agriculture as a whole should be not a parity of prices but a parity of income.

Farm Real Estate Situation and Outlook

A farm land boom now under way is threatening to get out of hand. Farms are turning over at a rate higher than in the boom period of 1919-20. City people, more than farmers, are stirring today's boom. These city people with money look upon farm land as one form of insurance against an inflation they are told to fear. Yet, in practice, it is turning out that the inflation of farm land prices really is the Nation's one prime example of inflation itself.

In the absence of land market control measures, land values may be expected to increase at a minimum rate of about 1% a month until the war ends. For one or two years following the war, the rise is expected to be greater. Already land values in the United States have risen 20% in the four years of this war as compared with 25% in four years of World War I. In Maryland, farm real estate values rose 24% in four years of World World War I, and 24% in the four years of World War II.

Many of the present curbing influences to a rise in land values are likely to be relieved after the war. Fewer funds are likely to be ab-

sorbed in war bond purchases and there will be danger of a full-fledged land boom at that time.

The favorable factors for increased land values are: High farm prices; high levels of farm income; accumulations of liquid funds at the disposal of farmers and others.

The restraining factors are: Higher costs; shortages of farm labor, equipment, and fertilizers; and transportation difficulties.

The outlook, then, is for a further rise in land values, as farm income and farm prices rise. Absentee landlords will be looking for farms as a place to invest some of their funds. Following the war, there will be a minimum of 7,000,000 soldiers and about 20,000,000 in war industries to be demobilized and returned to peace-time jobs. Some of these will wish to buy farms. As we enter the early post-war period, it seems probable that the demand of war-plant workers and returning soldiers for both full-time and part-time farms will become an influential element in the land market. The transition from full employment in war time to full employment in peace time will be more difficult than transition from peace-time employment to war-time employment. Military demobilization will not be easy.

The Army and Navy have already acquired 20,000,000 acres of land for use as camps, proving grounds, etc., and are still increasing their holdings. Fifty thousand farm families have been removed from this land, most of them going to work on other farms or going into war industries. Several million of these acres were good farm land. At the close of the war, at least some portion of this area will be available for conversion back into agricultural use.

With heavy demand for farm products a virtual certainty during the short-term period following the war, and with the United States determined to maintain and enlarge this demand in the long-term period, the United States will need to expand food production by every possible means, including the adoption of more efficient production practices, more intensive use of land resources, and extension of the area in cultivation.

Demand, Farm Income and Prices

Demand—the over-all demand for farm products is expected to average somewhat higher in 1944 than in 1943, but the rate of increase from now on will be much slower than in the last three years. Domestic civilian demand is expected to increase some, and demand for military, lend-lease, and foreign relief purposes will be substantially larger.

Military and foreign requirements for agricultural products contribute substantially to the demand. Today we are supplying food and other products to 41 areas. In 1943, one-fourth of our agricultural

food production was allocated to military, lend-lease, and other special needs, as compared with 14% in 1942 and 6% in 1941.

We are feeding tens of millions of people in other countries. The demand for food on the part of these peoples will increase further. The conquered countries of Europe will require 9,250,000 tons—or 250,000 carloads—of foodstuffs in the first 6 months after liberation.

Made up into a single train, this vast shipment would stretch two-thirds of the distance across the United States.

Furthermore, food will represent only a little more than one-third of the total of all commodities needed or required from outside sources for the conquered countries alone.

These figures do not cover the devastated portions of Russia, Denmark, Italy or the Axis countries, all of which are expected to require post-war help.

While an attempt will be made to get the liberated countries back on a more self-sustaining basis as soon as possible, they will have to be given aid for at least 2 or 3 years after shooting stops. Unquestionably, the demand for food will continue to be great during the remainder of this war, and will probably be even greater for a year or so following the war.

The farmer's job is to produce food. He knows how to do it; how to produce to the limit of his capacity if given a chance. It is true that the record production of the last three years is not a mere coincidence. In general, the seasons were favorable, but farmers did their part. They increased the average work week to 84 hours. Old men, women and children labored long hours in the fields to produce the food so vital to winning the war.

Immediately after the war, as during the war, farmers will face hungry markets for all they can produce. Income and buying power will continue to be high and food rationing may have to be continued so that the available food supplies may be distributed among consumers here as fairly as possible and to provide needed supplies for shipment abroad. In the years immediately following the war, the gap between supply and demand is likely to be even greater than it is now, for a large part of our supply will be needed for relief and rehabilitation in liberated countries.

These foods will consist of concentrated, high-value products such as we now are shipping over-seas under lend-lease, plus large quantities of grains and other high energy foods. Reserve stock piles in Canada, Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and other exporting countries will all be drawn upon.

So far as the American farmers are concerned, this short-term period is one in which their incomes will be determined by their capacity to produce. If supplied with the necessary machinery, supplies, and labor, American farmers can look forward with full confidence to good levels of income throughout the short-term period.

In the long-term period following the war, as requirements for lend-lease, military, and relief purposes begin to slacken, it will be possible to utilize more of our food production to satisfy domestic demand.

Continuation of the heavy demand for food in the long-term period will depend upon measures for the promotion of an expanding world economy, with freer trade, and a rising scale of living for the entire world.

The level of domestic demand for farm products over the longer pull will depend almost entirely on how nearly we keep our factories and our city workers as busy making the things we need in peace as we have kept them at military production during the war. Today this country is producing 50% more—in physical quantities—than it ever produced in time of peace. If we can hold production at these same levels while we convert from war to peace, and then relax the rationing controls as fast as we can produce the goods, farmers will have the biggest market for food products here at home that they have ever enjoyed.

Our exports in the long-term period will shift somewhat from the high-energy foods to exports of foundation livestock, work animals, and foods rich in nutritive value to improve the dietary standards abroad. We will also ship increasing quantities of citrus fruits, dried fruits, tobacco, oil cake, lard, wheat, and probably cotton. In other words, our exports will center on these products which we can produce most efficiently and in surplus above our own needs.

The United States is now the leading creditor nation of the world. If we are to expand our world trade we must be willing to accept other products in return. Imports pay for exports. If we export we must make up our minds to import an equal amount of goods; otherwise, what we sell will become a gift. Our reciprocal trade agreement is a form of barter which has arisen because of the breakdown in international credits for the reason just cited.

The United States now has trade agreements with 26 countries. In the fiscal year 1940-41, 65% of our export trade was with these countries. Following the war these trade agreements should either be perfected and retained or some other tariff adjustments should be worked out that will lead to freer, less restricted international trade. If trade agreements are maintained with other countries they should be limited mainly to things which we do not produce at home. In our dealings with

other nations we should take from them the things we need in exchange for the things they need. Nothing is gained by exchanging identical or competing commodities.

Farm Income. Cash farm income in the United States is estimated at $19,300,000,000 in 1943. For 1944, it is estimated at $21,800,000,000, an increase of 13% over 1943.

Cash farm income in the United States in 1943 is the highest on record and farm production expenses of $10,200,000,000 are also the highest on record.

In Maryland, cash farm income in 1942 was $124,815,000 and for 1943, it is estimated at $153,274,000, an increase of 18.5%.

Indications are that farmers are using the increased receipts to pay off debts, purchase war bonds, increase bank deposits, purchase better livestock, and are spending more on health improvement. Demand deposits of country banks in the United States are 239% higher than they were in the years of 1929-1931. Bank deposits held by farm people increased about 5 billion dollars from 1941 to 1943, and by the end of 1943, farmers had bought 2 billion dollars worth of war bonds. Farm mortgage debt is now reduced to the level that it was in 1916. Farm mortgage debt declined $1,071,000,000 between January, 1939 and January, 1944.

Prices. Prices received by farmers in the United States in 1943 averaged 88% higher than they were in the base period of 1910-1914. Prices paid by farmers averaged 67% higher. It is estimated that prices received by farmers will advance 6.4% in 1944 over the 1943 level. It is estimated that prices paid by farmers will advance 7.2% in 1944 over 1943. It should be observed, however, that wages of farm labor are not included in the prices-paid index. If wages of farm labor were included, since they constitute about 1/3 of the farmer's operating costs, the parity price ratio instead of being 117% of the 1910 to 1914 level would be slightly below 100%.

Farm wages in the United States are 180% higher than they were in the pre-war years, 1910-1914. Farm wages have risen 123% since October, 1939. It is expected that farm wages will advance in 1944 about 15% over the 1943 level.

Hourly earnings of factory workers in 1943 averaged over 4½ times as high as in the pre-war years, 1910-14. It is estimated that hourly earnings of factory workers in 1944 will average five times as high as in the years, 1910-1914. From 1939 to the end of 1943, wages increased more than three times as fast as did the cost of living.

Farm prices and income have been increasing since the outbreak of the war in the fall of 1939, and this trend is expected to continue in

1944, and probably for a year or so following the war. It is doubtful, however, if prices will continue to rise at the same rate during the next two years as has prevailed since the fall of 1939. Almost all farm prices are now subject to ceilings, either directly or through the effects of ceilings upon products of the commodities, and, although some further increase in prices may be expected to offset increases in costs and assure production, prices will probably rise at a much slower rate during the next year or so.

In the four years of World War I, wholesale prices of all commodities increased 91% over the 1910-1914 base, and by 1920, they had advanced 144%. Wholesale prices of all commodities in December of 1943 were 50% above the pre-war base period of 1910-1914.

Since the beginning of World War II, wholesale prices of all commodities have risen 37.4%. Wholesale prices of food have advanced 57.4%.

In World War I retail prices of food did not reach their peak until June, 1920. At that time, they were 126% higher than they were in the base years 1910-1914. Since August, 1939, retail prices of food have advanced 46.7%; and cost of living, 26%. In the comparable period of the first World War, cost of living rose 57%.

The tendency has been for both wholesale and retail prices of food to level off during the last several months. The administration is trying to prevent an inflationary price rise similar to what occurred during the first World War. Ceiling prices have been set on many commodities, and a rationing program has been put into effect with respect to certain commodities.

Failure to place a ceiling on industrial wages has caused the prices of many products to rise faster than they would otherwise, and whether we are able to hold prices down will depend much upon what is done about controlling industrial wage rates. Recent increases in wage rates to certain classes of industrial workers may be accepted as the cue to further increases in industrial wages. A person high in the councils of the United States and the United Nations, said that the taking over of the railroads by the Government and the walkout in the steel mills may have prolonged the war against Germany by six months. He characterized the railroad dispute as the damnedest crime ever committed against America. He described it as a great tragedy.

There were 3,737 strikes in 1943, despite labor's no-strike pledge of December, 1941. This was double the average of the 15 years prior to Pearl Harbor.

Wholesale and retail prices are likely to advance some as time goes on, as more men, machinery, and metals are taken for war purposes, thus lowering the nation's ability to produce consumer goods. The war program is rapidly increasing the public spending power. This means

that there is more money to spend for less goods, which will mean higher prices. Remember, that during the first World War, wholesale and retail prices did not reach their peak until 1920. If we are unlucky and unwise, inflation will be just as apparent during this war and following the war as it was during and following the first World War.

In conclusion, it seems to me that the forces which are mainly responsible for inflation are more pronounced in this war than in the first World War. Our debt will be nearly 10 times as great; industrial wages are 141% higher than they were in 1918 (In this connection let me say that industrial wages never declined much following the first World War); and consumer buying power is the highest on record.

If we do not have wise leadership, backed up with a well-planned, sound post-war planning program, we may well expect to witness the greatest depression within a few years following this war that this country has ever experienced.

If we do have a wise leadership, a sound well-planned program that will fully utilize our agricultural and industrial resources, properly finance the debt, and provide jobs for the returning soldiers and employees of war plants, then we may be able to prevent a severe depression and maintain a fairly high level of employment and income in the post-war era. It is of the utmost importance to farmers, business groups, consumers and all that this course shall prevail. This should be our main job in 1944 and 1945.

WARS AND AFTERMATHS OF WARS

THE VICIOUS SPIRALS

by Dr. S. H. DeVault, Head, Dept. of Agricultural Economics,
University of Maryland

The Upward Spiral

1. Huge government expenditures promote
2. Industrial activity, which in turn
3. Increases employment, which brings about
4. Increased wages; increased wages coupled with full employment means
5. Increased consumer purchasing power, which reflects itself in
6. Increased consumer demand resulting in
7. Rising prices including farm prices. These are followed by
8. Increased land values, which in turn bring about
9. Increased farm borrowings and greater mortgage indebtedness.

The Downward Spiral

1. Markedly decreased government expenditures will cause
2. Decreased industrial activity, which in turn
3. Lowers employment, which brings about

4. Decreased industrial pay rolls, and these result in
5. A drop in farm prices with prices falling more rapidly than farm expenses, followed by
6. Lower land values
7. Tax delinquencies
8. Farm foreclosures
9. Decreased mortgage indebtedness.

Requirements for Post-War Agricultural Prosperity

1. Have a well-planned program that will fully utilize our agricultural and industrial resources.

2. Have fairly full employment in industry by
   (1) Supplying consumer purchasing power for agricultural products.
   (2) Providing occupational jobs for the returning soldiers and workers in war plants, and for those in rural districts who do not care to farm or are not needed on the farm.
   (3) Having large quantities of industrial goods available to exchange for farm products.

3. Have a freer, less restricted international trade.
   (1) National security must be assured to all nations if they are not to build self-sufficient economies in preparation for war. Self-sufficiency is incompatible with a healthy foreign trade.
   (2) Nations must be assured access to essential raw materials.

4. Maintain a floor price on farm products at parity to prevent a collapse in farm prices.

5. Utilize materials and manpower in building rural highways, rural electric power lines, improving farm buildings, manufacturing of farm machinery, and improving the market facilities for farm products.

6. Make plans now to properly finance the war debt.

7. Plan now for the most efficient production and marketing of farm products.

8. Organize for greater bargaining power in purchasing farm supplies and in marketing farm products, so as to prevent a sudden severe drop in farm prices incompatible with taxes, distribution costs, industrial wages, etc.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF FARM PEOPLE IN THE WAR FINANCE PROGRAM

ALEX D. COBB

Our farm families have given their young men to the army; they have loaned men and women to industry to speed production of war materials,

and in spite of the drain on their manpower they have produced food to meet the steadily increasing demands of army, lend-lease, and civilians.

Agriculture has done a magnificent job. And that can be said for the production front as a whole. Some way or other, we have built up an army. We've built ships and tanks and planes. We've sent them all over the world, and we've kept them supplied with ammunition, repairs and food and clothing. And, we've also furnished equipment, food and clothing for our allies.

Now, all this takes money—money in amounts that just a few years ago would have sounded fabulous. We have spent billions, and we will spend billions more before it's over. And, when I say We, I mean just that—you and me and every man, woman and child in the United States, for we ARE the United States. We are fighting to preserve this country as a democracy, and so long as we remain a democracy, we are the Government. We retain our right to elect our representatives, and, if after a while we don't like the way things are being done, we have the right to transfer that power to new hands.

So, it's not only our responsibility to spend these vast sums of money, but it's also our responsibility to furnish the money to be spent.

How much money will it take, and do we have the money needed?

We don't know how much it will take, but we do know something of what we are spending as we go along. A late report tells us that we are spending about $265,000,000 a day for war now, and we can expect that amount to increase. You've all seen figures on what it costs to build various types of war equipment—$300,000 to build a bomber that is expendable in just 60 seconds of a 2-hour combat flight. Seven tons of materials shipped overseas for every soldier landed at an invasion point.

Let's bring these incredible figures down to a personal basis that we can understand. Did you know that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, the Government spent $577 on each of you ,and on every other individual in the United States, and that $532 of this went for war expenses? If my country is spending $500 on me annually to win my war, have I furnished my full share of money to meet this expense? And, am I pulling my weight, or am I riding on a pass?

And, now, do we have the money?

The answer is Yes—even surplus money that has not yet been put to work.

National income has continued to rise since 1940, but since we are concerned with the part that rural people can play, let's confine our present thoughts to the farm financial picture.

For the country as a whole, it is now estimated that farmers will have a cash surplus from their 1943 operations of somewhere between 5 billion and 6 billion dollars, after deducting from cash income the reasonable expenditures for operating farm business and meeting family living and personal expenses. Deposits in rural banks, in communities of 15,000 population or less, have increased two-and-one-half times since 1940, and are still growing.

Let's look at Maryland. In 1940, cash farm income in Maryland was $77,000,000. In April, 1943, it was estimated that your cash farm income for that year would be about $150,000,000. Final figures are not yet available, but by the end of September income from sale of crops and livestock was $127,529,000, so it would seem that the earlier estimate may be realized, and that would be over 100% increase in income in three years.

Now is the time of golden opportunity for farmers who can plan for the post-war period by continuing their production efforts, their first responsibility, and then getting debts in shape, avoiding unwise speculation, and then investing their surplus cash in War Bonds. These bonds are a safe investment, increasing in value after the first year, and in an emergency, can be turned into cash on short notice to provide replacements of farm and home equipment, and depreciation of buildings and machinery.

A farm and home money management program, based on the following outline was prepared by the Agricultural Section of the War Finance Division, and has been approved by the Federal Extension Service and recommended to the State Extension Services for consideration:

1. *Safe Debt Reduction Plan.*

   Use present surplus income to:

   (a) Pay off short term debts or adjust them to a schedule of annual interest and low principal payments through the anticipated post-war period of lower prices.

   (b) Reduce heavy debts to a safe level.

   (c) Build up a financial reserve of liquid assets to meet post-war interest and principal payments, and to avoid the need for future borrowing.

2. *Plan For Future Operating Costs.*

   (a) Create a reserve of liquid assets based on estimated annual depreciation, and replacement cost for farm and home equipment and buildings, which cannot be purchased now.

   (b) Build up funds for increased operating costs which will be greater than in the past.

3. *Plan To Avoid Unwise Speculation.*
   (a) Avoid jeopardizing present holdings through unwise investment in additional farm land beyond the immediate requirements for efficient operation.
   (b) Build up financial reserves instead of making speculative purchases which only tend to increase inflation.

4. *Plan A Reserve For Future Security And Needs.*
   (a) Lay up savings now out of surplus income against years of crop loss and low production.
   (b) Budget savings for specific purchases of modern home conveniences.
   (c) Set up saving funds earmarked for education of children.
   (d) Provide for funds to carry life insurance through possible future years of lower income.

5. *Plan Simplified Accounting Systems.*
   Simplify farm and home accounting systems so that they will meet the requirements of budgeting savings for specific purposes.

These suggestions, if carried out, can constitute our own personal contribution to the present program for raising the funds needed to finance the war. In addition to this, you may be called upon to provide leadership needed to accomplish a farm to farm canvass of farm families during war loan drives, and to assist with the educational program of the War Finance Division.

At the close of Dr. Cobb's talk, Mr. Wise made some announcements and the meeting adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION

MR. WEAGLY: We will now have the report of the Credentials Committee, Mr. Rinehart.

Mr. Rinehart read his report.

REPORT OF CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

County	Paid up Members	Number of Directors	Number of Delegates
Allegany	154	1	3
Anne Arundel	279	1	6
Baltimore	539	1	11
Calvert	167	1	3
Caroline	280	1	6
Carroll	457	1	9
Cecil	102	1	2
Charles	231	1	5

REPORT OF CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE—Continued

County	Paid up Members	Number of Directors	Number of Delegates
Dorchester	118	1	2
Frederick	794	2	16
Garrett	174	1	3
Harford	401	1	8
Howard	205	1	4
Kent	260	1	5
Montgomery	372	1	7
Prince George's	258	1	5
Queen Anne's	196	1	4
St. Mary's	149	1	3
Somerset	147	1	3
Talbot	165	1	3
Washington	334	1	7
Wicomico	400	1	8
Worcester	157	1	3
Associated Women		2	6
Md. Stockmen's Assn.		1	1
Md. State Horticultural Society		1	1
Md. State Poultry Council		1	1
Md. Cooperative Milk Producers' Assn., Inc.		1	3
Md. Tobacco Growers' Assn.		1	3
Hillsboro Queen Anne Cooperative		1	1
Md. Vegetable Growers' Assn.		1	1
Md. Crop Improvement Assn.		1	1
Md. State Horse Breeders' Assn.		1	1
Total	6339		

MR. WEAGLY: Thank you, Mr. Rinehart. Before I present your presiding officer for this afternoon, I want to say something about my close connection with these boys who will be awarded prizes. Because my father was a member of the State Board of Education, and could not drive his automobile, I had to drive him to the meetings, and so I had an opportunity to know these boys, and I have always taken great interest in this work.

Now, I want to present your Chairman for the afternoon, he comes from Harford County, and is one of our outstanding members,—Mr. Wilson A. Heaps.

MR. HEAPS: Thank you, Mr. Weagly. I am glad that the boys are the first on our program.

I will now present Dr. H. F. Cotterman, who will present the awards.

LIST OF WINNERS
in the
MARYLAND FARM BUREAU—F . F . A. PROJECT CONTEST

Project	*Rank*	*Winner*	*Teacher*	*High School*	*Award in War Stamps*	*Labor Income*
Baby Beef:	First	Charles F. Smith	Frederick W. Fuller	Jarrettsville	$3.00	$105.66
	Second	Charles L. Swift, Jr.	Frederick W. Fuller	Jarrettsville	2.00	97.70
	Third	Kenneth D. Phetteplace	Harold Remsberg	Smithsburg	1.00	82.60
						$285.96
Corn:	First	Albert Buckler	T. C. Martin	Hughesville	3.00	135.20
	Second	Harry E. Lawson	E. F. Holter	Frederick	2.00	127.65
	Third	James W. Gibson	C. E. Lacey	Pr. Frederick	1.00	22.40
						285.25
Dairy	First	George C. Fry	S. T. Lawler	Sandy Springs	3.00	1240.78
	Second	Donald D. Keller	J. H. Remsberg	Middletown	2.00	279.11
	Third	Calvert Heil	S. T. Lawler	Sandy Springs	1.00	159.52
						1679.41
Potato:	First	Albert Buckler	T. C. Martin	Hughesville	3.00	250.47
	Second	Fred Harvey	O. T. Graser	Oakland	2.00	364.95
	Third	Wendell W. Umbel	C. B. Miller	Friendsville	1.00	171.78
						787.20
Poultry:	First	Coolidge Nagel	E. E. Smith	Federalsburg	3.00	456.16
	Second	Allen Neave	T. C. Martin	Hughesville	2.00	425.44
	Third	Stanley Baker	O. T. Graser	Oakland	1.00	354.94
						1236.54
Swine:	First	Charles A. Morris	S. T. Lawler	Sandy Springs	3.00	457.38
	Second	Richard C. Rinehart	L. C. Biser	Taneytown	2.00	232.79
	Third	*Robert Burtner and *Carroll Burtner	E. F. Holter	Frederick	1.00	397.61
						1087.78

*Partnership Project

Partnership Project

Project	*Rank*	*Winner*	*Teacher*	*High School*	*Award in War Stamps*	*Labor Income*
Tobacco:	First	Albert Buckler	T. C. Martin	Hughesville	$3.00	$3271.09
	Second	Raymond Bowen	C. E. Lacey	Pr. Frederick	2.00	559.57
	Third	John Hardesty, Jr.	T. C. Martin	Hughesville	1.00	473.73
						4304.39
Tomato:	First	Frank R. Newcomer	Harold Remsberg	Smithsburg	3.00	97.34
	Second	Walter L. Breeding	E. E. Smith	Federalsburg	2.00	89.39
						186.73
Miscell. Crops:	First	L. W. Gearhart (raspberries)	Harold Remsberg	Smithsburg	3.00	244.41
	Second	Wendell W. Umbel (oats)	Charley B. Miller	Friendsville	2.00	87.47
						331.88
Miscell. Livestock:	First	Raymond Poole (sheep)	C. M. Wilson	Poolesville	3.00	56.24
	Second	C. F. Rinehart (rabbits)	L. C. Biser	Taneytown	2.00	54.75
	Third	Louis Bussler (rabbits)	S. T. Lawler	Sandy Springs	1.00	13.95
						124.94
Miscell. Truck:	First	Albert Buckler (garden)	T. C. Martin	Hughesville	3.00	156.96
	Second	B. E. Winders (sweet corn)	Harold Remsberg	Smithsburg	2.00	69.24
	Third	Charles Null (garden)	L. C. Riser	Taneytown	1.00	80.42
						306.62
Diversified Farming	First	*Albert Buckler	T. C. Martin	Hughesville	3.00	3847.07
	Second	**James W. Gibson	C. E. Lacey	Pr. Frederick	2.00	915.17
		***Wendell W. Umbel	C. B. Miller	Friendsville	1.00	420.66
						5182.90

*2 acres potatoes
7 acres tobacco
7 acres corn
2 acres garden
1 calf
2 pigs

**2 acres corn
1½ acres tobacco
1/8 acre potatoes
100 chickens
1 calf
6 hogs

***½ acre potatoes
2 calves
1 heifer
4¾ acres oats
11 sheep

Grand Total Labor Income $11,704.23
Average per project (41 projects) 285.47

MR. HEAPS: Farming is more than an occupation. It is a way of living. No group has contributed quite so much to this way of living as the farm women. They are a very important part of farm life. In view of that fact, it is rather appropriate that the first speaker this afternoon will speak to us on behalf of the farm women. I know that she needs no introduction. She has already passed sweet sixteen in farm work. She was presented at our last National Convention with a silver service in our behalf, as well as those present. Now, we are to enjoy hearing from her,—Mrs. Charles Sewell, Director of Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who will speak to us on the work of farm women.

THE WORK OF FARM WOMEN

MRS. CHARLES SEWELL

It is always a great treat for me to come back to the State of Maryland where I have met so many of you in days gone by. I had the pleasure of addressing your State meeting five years ago. I do want to say, as I said yesterday, I have heard so many expressions of gratitude for the very fine reception which you gave to the American Farm Bureau in the National Convention in Baltimore four years ago. I am delighted to bring to you this afternoon greetings of 750,000 women who form the membership of the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau. I am always glad to pay tribute to the fine cooperation we have enjoyed with the Maryland Farm Bureau.

We are in a very critical time. We find ourselves in a very hard position this afternoon. We are trying desperately to keep sweet without very much sugar, to be elastic without very much rubber. We are glad to be able to relax a little bit and enjoy the second cup of coffee. I hope you have had yours so that you can keep awake when I talk to you.

It is very difficult after 16 years to find new subjects to talk about. I feel very much like the Chinese man, who was baptized by a minister who believed in baptism by sprinkling. A little while later some one came along and told him he could not be saved unless he was baptized by immersion. This argument and controversy so confused the Chinese, and he said "It is just like the white man's potato. You can bake it, you can roast it, but no matter how you cook it, it is still just a potato." My speeches are just the same.

I would like to borrow the phrase the young people use in their organization program. As I look around to see what I can talk to you about the first thing I am reminded of is the great change in the status of farm women in America from what it was even a generation ago. In fact, some people say it is now becoming a woman's world. Men do not have the best as they used to have. When a man is born, the first question asked is "How is his mother?" When he is married they say

"What a beautiful bride". When he dies and passes on, they ask "How much did he leave his wife?" (Laughter)

I read the other day of a woman who was tied up in this hazardous business of Christmas shopping. She met a friend, and she said "I am having an awful time. I am trying to shop for my husband." The friend asked, "have you had any offers yet?". So you see, we cannot tell exactly how we are going to get along.

I wish that time permitted me to tell you of some of the things I have seen, farm women, farm men, boys and girls, around, forward and back, in this great country. I wish that I might take you in fancy with me to the great State of Utah, and watch the people there and some of the things they have done in feeding the people of that great State under the direction of the Mormon Church. Last spring, I went with a company of farm people to visit the great central storehouse of this country; they used their own trucks, their own people, and nobody was allowed to eat who had not worked and earned their food. I saw the great storehouse that has been full since the days when people gleaned their wheat. Always there was 250,000 bushels of wheat there to be available to care for their people. The only time it was taken out was in the first World War at the request of President Hoover.

Then, I would like to take you with me to a Florida farm, where you would see celery grown in great quantities; what would bring 75 cents to the grower will bring $2.75 when it gets to New York. I learn many things as I go to the different parts of this country. I see the part the women have taken in helping to produce the great crop that was produced this past year. I agree with Abe Martin that after all perhaps the cheapest source of labor is the farmer's wife; she has certainly done her part.

I am not going to take your time to go too far over the country. There are many paths up the mountain side, but when you get to the top the view is just the same, no matter in which direction you look.

For a little while I would like to take you with me to the place that I know better than all the others. I want to look and have you look with me at the kind of farm which means so much to me, to share with you the freshness, the fragrance of my Indiana farm. As I go back, I see many changes. I see the Victory farm families living on those farms. Very few of the people who were there when Mr. Sewell and I first went there are still there. Great changes have taken place; I see the service flags in the windows, the stars and stripes floating above their homes, those people who are working so hard to carry out the wish of their Government, all this in place of broad fields of corn which I knew so well, and which I helped to grow years ago. They tell me the turkeys even say "global" now instead of "gobble". It has been a hard year for

us out there. Last year, after the usual planting, Nature wept so hard she wiped the crops away for days on end, but finally she relented, she was sorry, and the folks got busy and had a better crop than they had first expected. I would like to tell you of some of the lessons I have learned out there. I am sure you will agree with me that in this, our life, exempt from public haunt, we find tongues in trees, books in running brooks, sermons in stones, and good in everything.

I have been somewhat handicapped, and sometimes embarrassed as I worked from one part of this country to another,—the west is so different from the east, and when I was below the Mason and Dixon Line I heard the north and the mid-west. They criticized them. They preferred to feed their own stock, rather than let you have the corn for the dairy and the poultry, and since I have both hogs and corn, I was somewhat on a spot. I learned a great many lessons from the farm people I met.

Pigs have had a lot more to do with the development of the country than you realize. There has been a great change in the production of pigs. When I first started in my career as a farmer's wife, pigs were just pigs, but they ceased to be just pigs with improved sanitation conditions surrounding them. The mothers of pigs are surrounded with more care than is afforded the mothers of men. Some of them have pedigrees as long as a D. A. R. You hear so much about the innocent little pigs. I am not going to take time to tell you now my reasons why that idea should be changed, but I do tell you firmly that there never was an innocent little pig. Did you ever catch one in your flower bed, and try to get it out? Just do that sometime and see if you will think that an innocent little pig.

I just want to add this about the pigs,—I watched the little pigs one day as they nestled up in the pig pen, but they did not do it from any idea of affection for the other little pig, they only wanted to get themselves warm. We are very much like that ourselves. If you watch people in a ticket office, most of them are trying to get ahead of some one else, not willing to take their turn.

We look around the country and see the piles of scrap iron collected: there is not much left. The farm people did a good job at that. I wonder if we realized all that in those days when China was begging us not to send that scrap iron over to help the Japs to fight them, and now some of that very same scrap iron is turned against our own boys. We need to plan and work for the time which will immediately follow the war. I am not going to tell you what I think about subsidies. I have the words, but I should not use them. It reminds me very briefly of the story which my good father used to tell of a certain man who gave his children a nickel to go to bed without their supper, and then charged them for their breakfast the next morning. That is my idea

of what they mean by subsidies. I have been, as you have been, very much interested in the subsidy program, of how the people have, as Mrs. Fry suggested, done so much in getting the crops harvested with so little help, and certainly little machinery, and then it looks very bad to think that others get the benefit.

I have the profoundest respect for organized working men in this country. As I got on the train to come out here day before yesterday, I was glad to think the man who piloted my train was a member of an organized group, that he perhaps had the proper amount of rest, because on his peace of mind depended to a very large degree not only my own safety but the safety of all the other passengers running through the night, but I have very little sympathy for the abuse of that privilege. When we learn from the Bureau of Labor Statistics the hours of labor wasted in the month of November,—just think if we applied that to the American farmers who work all day, early in the morning sometimes until in the night,—if we applied that to the six and a half million farmers in the United States,—what that would have meant to the consumer, in America, or in the whole world,—to the boys in service when they would listen in vain to the welcome call of mess. We just cannot do it, we must keep on. I heard of two boys from one of the counties in the south in the back country who had been inducted into the Army, and they were assigned to Kitchen Police duty. One of them asked the other "What is this K. P. they are talking about?" The other said "I don't know, I guess it just means Keep Peeling." The farmers have got to do that.

We are told that we should change from a meat diet and use more of this soybean which has come to be so important to us. I am ready to start my campaign, not for a pork roast in every oven,—but I am wondering if you would not be interested along those lines. The idea in the east that you are not getting all the feed you think you should have goes back farther than you think.

I should like to say to you people here in the Eastern part of the United States that we people out there are not all pigs, we do not want to get the best of you. We are urged to grow more hogs, and that needs more corn, and every acre of soybeans we grow reduces the number we can put in corn. I have some figures that may show you the reasons I think the farm people have a hard time to get along now. In 1918, No. 1 Dark Northern Wheat brought $2.25 a bushel,—a dozen doughnuts were 14¢, a loaf of bread 7¢. In November, 1943, wheat was $1.68 a bushel, bread 10¢, doughnuts 25¢. In 1918, hogs were $17.30 as compared with $13.15 in 1943. In 1918, picnic hams were 25¢ a pound; in 1943, 31¢ a pound. When I think of my own production costs during the last three or four years, I feel like two boys in a fox hole—every time they stuck their heads out a Jap would snipe at them, and one of them said "I am just about ready to give up". The other said "Even at that, it still beats farm life."

Then, too, I feel that we are going to be faced with a grain shortage next year. You know it takes 10 bushels of grain to make a gallon of alcohol,—you could get a full set of tires for your car or truck out of what that alcohol costs, that amount of grain would feed 40 cows a half a peck of grain twice a day.

One of the differences between human beings and pigs is that after all these years of development pigs are still just pigs, but man has been given something better, and there is much more expected of us farmers. That reminds me of the parable of the man who wanted a gift from the gods. He was told a spark was hidden for him to find. He wanted to know where it was hidden,—"If you have put it on the mountain top I will climb up and find it", but it was not there. If it was in the sea he would go down and bring it back, but the God said "That is my secret, I have put it where man will never think to look for it, I have hidden it within himself." That spark has changed man from the beasts and made it possible for him to do difficult things. So, today you and I have a great deal resting upon us. I am reminded of an ancient and honorable quotation with which I have been familiar all my life, and it certainly applies to farm people in the days to come this year. This is a campaign year, 1944; whether or not it is a war year, still we have the Presidential campaign. This is my quotation which I should like to leave with you,—"Don't buy a pig in a 'poke' ". We should have a pretty good idea of the individuals for whom we are to vote, from the lowest office to the President of the United States. We should closely scrutinize the issues and the platforms of the parties.

We have heard a good deal lately about the changing of the name "New Deal" and as I looked up some of the meanings of the term "New Deal" I would like to leave them with you. "New" means green or raw, or immature or virgin, while the word "deal" means distribute, allot, dispense, deliver, trade, give, administer, bestow and barter. I read this little statement the other day:— "The New Deal is above all, knows all, and runs all except John L. Lewis." (Laughter). But, seriously, friends, this is a good time for you and me to give serious thought to the campaigns, and let's give the alphabet back to the babies, let's start out on the good old American plan of doing things. I will offer a slogan to everybody who plans to live in America today: "Wake up, Watch out, Widen your Horizons, Warrant Trust, Work Hard, Win War and Welcome Peace".

Today the farm folks are challenged and as you sit here and deliberate together the things you say, and the things you do, the statements you make receive widespread attention in the metropolitan press of this country. We need the food that must be produced, and we have no choice but to produce it. On the front lines, the farm boys, from your homes and from mine must be provided not only with food, but with necessary implements of war, with money, and I think we as farm people are ready

to say to the other groups of society in this land,—we will do our part, we want you to come on and do yours. I do not want to profiteer. I have not been able to do so. Always I am glad to pay the taxes and bills and come out with what I started with. As I watched the fine boys here today receiving their just awards, I think of them as if they were my own boys. I think I do not want to hand those farms back to those boys with an apology. We want to give them the same opportunities in their farming business as they might have if they were in the professions of law or medicine. That is the profession in which they want to engage at this particular time.

You have in Maryland a great resource in the women of your State. Yesterday in their meeting, they pledged themselves to help you gain the membership in the Maryland Farm Bureau which you pledged the American Farm Bureau Federation to raise.

I want to offer one more slogan in conclusion "Take off your hat to the Past; take off your coat to the Future".

MR. HEAPS: I think you will agree with me that we will all remember Indiana, not only for its wonderful crops, but for its wonderful personalities.

MR. HEAPS: Mrs. Sewell suggested something that I neglected to comment on. Before presenting Mr. Kilgore, I would like to remind those of you who attended the National Convention, and to also remind those of you who did not, that we pledged ourselves to raise the membership considerably in the coming year. I do not know whether I was really supposed to say anything about that, but I am going to tell you that your people assembled pledged in your behalf to the American Farm Bureau a great increase in our membership this year, and we must go home and prepare to do the job.

Mr. Kilgore, our next speaker, will bring us greetings from the National organization, and take back our pledge of increased membership, because we know the strength of our organization is our membership. That is our job, and we must do it.

Mr. Kilgore comes from Kentucky, he comes to us as Director of the newly established Public Relations Department of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I am very glad at this time to present Mr. Ben Kilgore.

ADDRESS

BEN KILGORE

I am especially pleased to have this opportunity to talk to you, although I am on a very difficult spot. I have never been in this position before,—to have to follow the charming and lovable leader, Mrs. Sewell,

who is just the sweetheart of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I am a great admirer of Ed. O'Neal, that fighting Irishman, and I know many of our State and National leaders, but I am going to tell you that Mrs. Sewell is the only National leader that I have never heard make a failure of any speech on any occasion, and that is a challenge to have to follow her,—but there is one thing about it, you can sit here and listen to her and get a lift, an inspiration that would almost inspire anybody to make a good speech.

Like Mrs. Sewell, I want to congratulate you on the splendid membership you have, and for the increase in membership to which you have pledged yourselves for next year. We have 700,000 in the National organization and we want to bring that up to a million. I believe the Farm Bureau is going places, going to exceed that number, we are going to exceed in membership anything we have ever dreamed of in years gone by. I have been traveling in 15 States, giving Farm Bureau talks like this, and everywhere I have seen in the faces of the men and women who listened a desire to build a Farm Bureau with parity of power, sufficient to enable us to secure parity of price and parity of opportunity, an opportunity to sit around the council tables of the Nation with other leaders to build a world of lasting peace in the years to come. I believe this can be done. I believe we can achieve this if we continue to press forward as we are doing at the present time.

I feel confident if we all continue down the road with a militant and aggressive spirit, such as I have seen in 15 States, we will build through Farm Bureau an enviable position for Agriculture, not only to help farm people but to build a greater nation and a valuable contribution to the whole world for a lasting peace. I do not believe any individual or any organization can achieve such a goal unless they put first the opportunity to help other people, their fellow man,—not to permit their own interest to take the lead, but the interest of their fellow men, and the interest of their organization always to the fore, and I believe that is the desire of the Maryland Farm Bureau, just as it is of the American Farm Bureau Federation. As one farmer said "You can't spread happiness on other people without getting a few drops on yourself". That is the spirit towards which we are building for the Farm Bureau in the years to come.

This afternoon I want to bring you a little talk on Victory on five points.

The first Victory that I will outline is Victory through *Independence.* A fellow who has to have somebody else help him is not in a position to help himself. Everyone should have an independent outlook on life. Mrs. Sewell talked about the kind of farm business that she wants to see handed down to the type of fine farm boys that you showed here this afternoon. So, we are going to build that kind of agriculture in America, if we unite in Maryland, in all the other States and in the nation.

Independence is not an easy thing to achieve. If we accept subsidies, then we let the other fellow run the show, and we just follow along. If we do that, we will never become independent, and never have parity of price, and parity of opportunity along with other groups. We must build a united front in agriculture all along the line, just as they do in other industries. On January 3rd, the Kentucky Farm Bureau took over the ownership of its own Insurance Company. That is the only casuality insurance company that has ever been built in Kentucky owned and operated by Kentucky people, and I had the time of my life in helping to build that company. It took the farmers to do that. The lawyers did not do it, the doctors did not do it. They did not have the courage, and the other groups could not do it, the farmers led the way.

Then, I would like to talk a little bit about a Victory through *Contribution.* You could not begin to discuss this without talking about the contribution of farm people in helping to win this terrible global war. We have over two million of our finest farm boys in active service, a large number of our farm boys in the war factories,—in the last three years of this war we have established new records for total production on our part. One of your speakers this morning said that in order to accomplish what was required of us we had to work 84 hours a week. Regardless of everything we will keep faith with the boys facing death each morning on far-flung battle fields all over the world. I want to mention just one thing on price subsidy that I meant to say on Independence. We do not want to increase the burden that those boys will have to bear. We do not want those boys while fighting our battles for us at $50.00 a month to come home and have to bear the burden of the debts we have raised while they are gone. The American Farm Bureau Federation and the various State groups on the home front want to share in the sacrifice. We do not want to shift our burdens on them when they come home. We do not want them not only to fight for us, but to give them the job of paying back these debts. What the Government pays in subsidies now we will have to pay back four-fold later.

We must contribute by helping the smaller States, the weaker Counties in Farm Bureau, as the strong ones have helped us in the past. In one County in Indiana 80 percent of the farms are run by tenants, all members of the Farm Bureau. The Farm Bureau in that County is not represented by the large, the rich farmers, but by the tenant-farmers. I believe in a tenant-purchase program. I believe in a number of these other programs, but we must all work together to build a nation of home-owning and home-loving farmers, all living on their own lands, if we are to preserve in this nation the type of democracy passed down to us through the blood and sacrifice of our forefathers so many years ago.

Now, we pass to the third Victory,—Victory through *Farm Improvements.* If there is any other program in Kentucky which has proved

successful, it is the program of electrification. In six short years, we have been able to work cooperatively to make an increase of from 10,000 people having electric power in their homes to 60,000,—that in six short years. The Farm Bureau did that. I believe the Farm Bureau must take charge of farm improvements, and rural education, and build them to the point where we can go forward and give the farm owners equal benefits with the people in the city homes of our nation. We want to do this under our own power through voluntary cooperation, not have the Government doing it for us. We want these improvements in farm homes to hand down to our children, we want to build better rural homes with electric lights, with running water, with opportunities for happier living for the people on our farms.

Then, I want to come to the fourth Victory,—not the victory through independence, but Victory through *inter-dependence.* You know when your children grow up, you find your greatest task,—at least my greatest task is to learn to see the other fellow's viewpoint, and to work side by side with him. I have not very much sympathy with John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers, but last summer in my political campaign when I went through eastern Kentucky and saw the shacks that some of those miners had to live in, I thought I would not like to have my farmers live as some of those people had to live. I saw and understood something of their side of the question. We have got to become inter-dependent as we work out our problems, as we sit around the table with other groups, and see their side, as we attempt to work our problems out in this country. As head of your newly created Public Relations Department, I have not only to work with the farm people, but I have got to learn to work with the city people, with industry, with all the other groups, and get them to present their side; I must listen to their side as well as present ours, if we are to contribute to the general welfare and to the happiness and to the progress of this greatest of all nations.

Finally, we must have Victory through *Christian Living.* This is a little difficult thing for me to speak of, because I must confess to you I do not always practice what I preach, and I say to you very frankly from my heart that I speak on this subject with considerable embarrassment, not that I have any apology to make, but it is something that I believe in so sincerely that I realize my inability to put it over just exactly as I would like to. I spoke about this in Iowa, in one of the richest Counties of that State. There was a newspaper editor there, a rough-talking, hard-boiled fellow, I thought he would laugh at me, but when he was driving me back to Cedar Rapids, he said "Ben, I liked your speech. I have two brothers in military service in foreign lands. What you were talking about tonight is true; that is what we must do if we are ever to achieve in America this lasting peace we are always talking about. There was one simple thing taught me by the people that I loved when I was about 17 years of age,—"if you will bring to

the Lord 10% of the first fruits of your earnings and set it apart for Him, you will never want for anything, your storehouse will run over." I believe you must do one of two things,—you must play fair with Christ or pay the penalty, "render unto God the things that are God's and unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." We have a very sensible command in the Bible,—"Bring the tithe of the first fruits into the storehouse of the Lord." That 10% seems to be the standard for other requirements,—10% for war bonds, 10% Victory tax, all of which I am for, but I say to you that you must make your choice.

So, my friends, I bring this addition to the Victory through Independence, to the Victory through Contribution, to the Victory through inter-dependence, the Victory through Rural Improvements, this Victory through Christian Living. We must bring back the faith of our forefathers, and keep the covenant, give the tithe of the first fruits not only of our money, which is least important, but the first fruits of our boys and girls, the first fruits of at least 10% of our time and diligence to spreading the Gospel of Christ and Christian Living throughout our neighborhoods, our State, our Nation and the world. I am wondering if some of the confusion and chaos and complexities that face us even now as our armies march forward to victory would not begin to disappear a little if we were to do that.

You and I talk about post-war plans, and we are all for it, but unless we can weave into the fibre of our National life the Spirit of Christ I am wondering whether or not we are going to achieve the lasting peace we talk about.

I want to leave that thought in your mind. As I rode back from Cedar Rapids with that man, I was wondering if somehow, some way we could not start a movement among the farm people in America, the simple, God-fearing people who because of the very nature of their work walk hand in hand with God, in their daily life, so that we might dedicate the flower of our youth to Christian service in their work in the armed service; I wonder if the farm people could not lead in such a program out of the confusion and chaos of our time. I believe farm people can do that. I am going to talk it up and down this land, in every State I go. I believe it is fundamental, it will work.

We in America must learn to live and let live, learn to build a land of land-owning farmers living on their own land. If we will work towards these five victories,—the greatest being that of Christian Living, day by day, I believe the farm people of America can hold high the torch, and can lead the way to really bring into the world freedom of opportunity all over the world, a lasting peace and a happier and better world.

MR. HEAPS: It is a rather difficult task for me to introduce the next speaker, our Congressman from the 2nd District, but it is a pleasure

for me to present him. I feel sure that because he has qualified himself as a successful farmer, he will be an added strength to us in Congress. As I talked to some of his friends, our mutual friends, we all agreed that he is a man who has taken a strong stand, and has fought right along for what he considers our best interests. I am glad to present at this time, the Honorable H. Streett Baldwin, Congressman from the 2nd Congressional District of Maryland.

ADDRESS

Hon. H. Streett Baldwin

I am here today, as your Chairman told you, first as a farmer, and I think because of that fact I might be a little better able to talk to you than I otherwise would be. I have farmed all my life, never engaged in any other business. My people have always been farming people. I feel I know something about farmers and their problems. It is the only business I know. I have not been a politician very long. I want, however, to say this by way of preface. We do not always agree even though we may belong to the same organization. I have been very critical, sometimes, of some of the farm programs of our organization. I am not here to mince words, but I am here to give a frank discussion of my views as to what I think the problems of Agriculture are.

I want to preface my remarks again with the remark that I have never had any other business and also that as a farmer I never accepted a cent from the Federal Government in any way for payment for anything on my farm.

There are a lot of things I could talk to you about this afternoon, but I do not want to take too much of your time. I know you have other speakers. One thing I want to say is that I know a little bit about the subsidy legislation still pending in Congress. It came before the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House. I sat every morning for a month listening to the testimony. A large part of the press of our country has spoken in discussing this subsidy program and the farmers' opposition to subsidies, that the farmers were,—or inferring that they were—against subsidies because they did not believe in the stabilization program. I do not believe that there is a farmer in this room that would not do everthing in his power to bring about stabilization.

To give you a little history, that was passed as an emergency war measure, at the suggestion of the President, and it gave him the power that he as administrator,—and very properly so in war time,—should have. We cannot operate a Democracy in war times as in peace times. That legislation, however, did not anticipate the payment of subsidies to any group, as such. The stabilization program was intended to stop inflation. I do not think there is a farmer in this country,—at least I

hope not, who wants to disorganize our war economy by making an exorbitant profit. The idea back of the stabilization program was to stop and prevent any group, any industry, any business from making exorbitant profits out of this war. That was right and proper. But, it certainly did not intend the Government agencies to set a price on any product below the cost of production, and that should never be done in our wartime program. It was always intended that a fair profit should be permitted.

Ladies and gentlemen, a lot of our labor troubles today are due primarily to the fact that the stabilization program has not been handled quite as it should. You cannot blame one group of people whose wages are frozen at a certain level, when they see another group making three times as much for the same number of hours. The stabilization program never intended anyone to do that. It was never intended to let one group of people make double the wages they should and to freeze the wages of another group working the same number of hours.

That is the reason people who know something about subsidies and the subsidy program are opposed to subsidies. Had the stabilization program been handled in the right way in the beginning, it would not have been necessary to have subsidies,—by that I mean consumer subsidies. Of course, the Government had to subsidize the manufacture of some war materials in order to get the proper production. I resent the inference on the part of the press to saddle the farming people of America with the idea that they are opposed to the stabilization program because they are opposed to subsidies. The proper story should be told to the people of this country.

Oh, yes, they ask us for a billion dollars,—if then you listen to the subsidy program, it will not be a billion, it will be much more. When you can take the money out of the Federal treasury to buy food for the consumers of this country, when you also go to the Federal treasury to borrow money to pay the producers for that commodity,—then you do not have a democracy. The only reason we should give powers of that kind is as a war emergency when absolutely necessary to win the war, and I still say the subsidy program is not necessary, and subsidies for the consumer would not have been necessary had the stabilization program been properly handled from the beginning.

I do not know just what you folks are interested in particularly that I might talk to you about from the National standpoint, except what we as farm people are going to face, and I can assure you that great responsibilities are going to be ours when this war ends. We have assumed, we have accepted, and have carried out the program of producing food for this nation and a great many other nations, and you have done that under the most serious handicaps,—lack of labor, lack of machinery, but the farmers of this country can point with pride to their production, and they have every right to be proud. The fact of

the matter is, however, if we are not given certain special considerations, there may be a slowdown in production as has been done in so many other instances. When this war is over, we are going to face a critical situation, not only in agriculture, but in every other industry. As a Member of Congress, and as your Representative, not only from the district from which I was elected, but as a Representative from every district in Maryland, I do not think I would be doing you or myself justice if I were to stand here and paint you a rosy picture of today as is often done. That is easy to say, and even easier to listen to.

In the first place, we are farmers and citizens of a great nation and we have a great problem and a great responsibility in determining first what the foreign policy of this nation will be before we can even think about the domestic problems. America must determine and must make up its mind that we are going to have a foreign policy, and we should never again allow that foreign policy to break down. The Monroe Doctrine was all right for those times. We want to have peace and security in times of peace, and we have to adjust our foreign policy to meet the present situation in the world. Oh, that the people in this country had been willing to assume our responsibility to the rest of the world, had assumed and been willing to assume our responsibility from a National standpoint, your boys and my boys might not be on foreign battle fields today. In spite of that, when looking at it from a selfish standpoint, we cannot hope to have a normal economy in peace unless we are willing to assume our proper responsibilities from an international standpoint, and make treaties with other nations to keep peace throughout the entire world. If we do not, and we revert to the old isolation ideas that we had before this war, if we in America think we can secrete ourselves, build a wall around us, after this war is over, we will not have gained much by it. We in America must be willing to assume as a nation our responsibilities to the rest of the world, we must be willing and we should accept them. I am not now saying that we should enter any great International Association, but we should ally ourselves with the other great nations willing with large resources to maintain peace, and if we do that, then our domestic problems may come to the fore,—our problems of what we are going to do after this war is over. What is our future?

There is no one as I said before who can with truth paint you a rosy picture. It cannot be anything but serious, it is going to be a challenge to each and every one of us to meet the problems that will confront us. After being in such a war as we have been for a number of years, after having to produce to the great extent which we have had to do, it will be very hard to change to times of peace. You can realize as readily as I can the difficulties which agriculture is going to face when the war is over, with production way beyond what we can consume. Of course, other industries will have the same problem, but I do not believe to the same extent as agriculture.

Believe it or not, we in America today are at the cross roads of democracy. We talk about fighting for democracy, about free enterprise, but, if you were as close to the Government in Washington as we are in Congress, you would realize that unless the people of America demand that we keep our democracy, when this war is over we will have more of what is called National Socialism. Whenever a group of people, whenever an industry goes to the Government for help, a certain part of freedom is given up. Whenever Government takes over control of business as a means of helping you, just that much you give up your free action over your business. I know you may think when this war is over that the supervision over your business will be given up, but you are wrong. They are not only not going to give it up, but they are striving to extend the powers which they now have. When you go to the Government for help, it is no longer your privilege to do as you want with your property, and when that happens the very thing that made the farmers of this nation great, and that made the nation itself great will be lost. It is going to be a challenge to us to carry on without too much help from the Government. The reason I am saying this to you is that it is going to be a hard situation for you, when you want help, and you feel that the Government will give you help, and you think it will be perfectly proper to get the help you need, but always remember to the extent that you get that help just to the same extent do you give up your control over your own affairs.

In a democracy you cannot have a Government by any special group or by special groups and still have a democracy. There should be no special privilege to any one group, and no special group should be allowed to take advantage of any other group. Justice should prevail, it is the prerogative of a democratic country, but when we allow special groups to get special advantages from the Government, that leads to other groups wanting the same thing. Look at it directly. It is easy, oh, how easy it would be if we could feel that we as farmers when we are unable to solve our problems may go to Uncle Sam and have him direct and plan for us! It would be much easier for me to tell you to do that, that it would work,—but I now tell you it will not work.

Industry will be in the same situation. We should never allow industry to build a tariff wall around this country. We must make up our minds that we are willing to make whatever sacrifice may be necessary, we must assume whatever responsibilities that may be ours to preserve our democracy. We take things too much for granted in this generation. We must realize that they were bought at a great price for us years ago, but when we come face to face with those problems and the solution of them when this war is over, we will find that the responsibilities of this generation are the greatest since the foundation of our country. We must face those problems, and remember what sacrifice, what hardships our forefathers had to build this America for us. They came here and carved out of the wilderness this great nation

that we call America today, that you and I have, at what a great cost of sacrifice! They did it because they believed in liberty and freedom in a nation and a home where men and women may develop according to their ability, with freedom from tyranny. They believed in a principle, and they had strength to stand by that principle. I believe we in America today are going to meet those problems and are going to solve those problems after the war; we will if we can live up to the heritage, the traditions which we as their descendants have. Ladies and gentlemen, it is a challenge to us. God give us strength to meet it!

At the conclusion of Mr. Baldwin's address, the meeting adjourned after some announcements given by Mr. Wise.

"A" AWARD TO WORCESTER COUNTY

Presented by Brigadier General PHILIP HAYES, Commanding General, Third Service Command.

"Mr. Symons, distinguished guests, Ladies and Gentleman, and particularly Mr. Northam and the group representing Worcester County, I am happy indeed to have the privilege of presenting you with the War Food "A" Flag.

Winning this Certificate of Award and emblematic Flag, has brought the highest agricultural honors in the Maryland Free State to its eastern most county. That you have elected to receive the Award here tonight at this gathering, rather than hold a local celebration, with its resultant cessation of work and production, and literally sharing the distinction that is yours with the rest of the State is another point of congratulation.

You are receiving the Award because of your achievements in the fields of agriculture. The Award that comes to you carries with it the congratulations of our soldiers and sailors. What you have done and are continuing to do, you are doing for America, and in accepting this Award, you do more than acknowledge a commendation for a task well done. You pledge yourselves, in effect, to continue to do a good job to the best of your ability.

Every time you see that pennant flying, you will remind yourselves that you are outstanding troops of the production line. There is a joint Army and Navy "E" Award for industrial plants with outstanding production records. Less than three percent of the great establishments engaged in producing the materiels of war over the nation have attained that high honor. Yours, in the war time agricultural effort, is an equally outstanding achievement.

Production for victory in this war must be all-inclusive and continuous. Everybody's job, from the farm, the productive field of the

good earth so dear to the true farmer, to the firing fronts where the blood of your sons and relatives blots the battle-torn soil, is a link in a chain. If you falter for any reason, a battle may be lost.

This we cannot endure. Our stake in this war is too great. We must and we will win.

It is truly said that not every soldier can be the bravest man in battle. Each man can only do his best. Not every regiment can lead in the attack. Only those who have proven themselves in the past are given the privilege and duty of being in the forefront in battle. That is a right and an obligation they have won.

These principles apply in your particular situation, for in the field of agriculture, not every county can win the War Food "A" banner and certificate. Not every county can fly this banner. Others throughout the nation and in your own State, as loyal Americans, will give their best, and will strive to keep pace with you.

You have won the right to have leadership expected of you. Because you have proven yourselves, the Army and the Navy look to you to continue to be first in the battle of production, and by your leadership, others will be inspired to better production effort.

In this global war the United Nations have many battle and production fronts on which to fight, but we know that here in Agricultural Maryland, and Worcester County in particular, is one sector that is in the safe hands of top-flight soldiers of production.

It is very true that our fighting men must rely on the workers here on the home front. They have the assurance that you will not let them down.

I know that you will not let them down, and, as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, and signalizing our recognition of the efforts of the farm people, not only here, but everywhere, to help us win the Victory, I take pleasure in presenting to the farm families of Worcester County, on behalf of the War Food Administration, and the Maryland United States Department of Agriculture War Board, this Agricultural Achievement "A" Flag.

BUSINESS SESSION

Friday, January 14, 1944, 10:00 a. m.

Mr. Weagly called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.

MR. WEAGLY: At this time Mr. Wise will read the call of this meeting:

Dec. 13, 1943

TO COUNTY SECRETARIES AND AFFILIATE
AND ASSOCIATE SECRETARIES

Notice of Annual Meeting of Members of Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc

Dear Sir:

Official notice is hereby given you that the Board of Directors of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., has authorized the calling of the next annual meeting of the Corporation for Jan. 13 and 14, 1944, Lord Baltimore Hotel, Baltimore, Md.; the meeting to continue from day to day until all business that may come before the meeting has been properly disposed of. All sessions of the annual meeting will be held in the Ballroom of the Lord Baltimore Hotel. Blanks are enclosed for you to submit the credentials of your directors and delegates for this meeting.

Very truly yours,

C. E. WISE, JR.
Secretary-Treasurer
MARYLAND FARM BUREAU, Inc.

CEW:MD
Enc.

Mr. Weagly—We will hear the roll of voting delegates.

Mr. Rinehart, Chairman of Credentials Committee, called the roll:

Allegany: Harry J. Barton, Hugh Stevenson, Geo. M. Barton; *Anne Arundel*: O. F. Grimes, A. W. Taylor, Mrs. Roland Leitch, Preston Taylor, C. Stallings Moreland; *Baltimore*: F. Ridgely Todd, Mervin Choate, J. Lynch, Charles Chilcote, Henry Emmel, P. C. Turner, G. Wm. Sattler, W. M. Anderson, Clinton Armacost, J. M. Hoshall; *Calvert*: Julius P. Parran, Douglas Parran, Thomas Mackall, Calvert Buckler; *Caroline*: C. J. Kern, J. Boone Jarrell, W. S. Carroll, H. L. Clark, Roy Merriken, John Smith, James Stack; *Carroll*: Jesse Hull, Luther Hoffman, Wm. S. Hoff, Curtis Rash, Walter Myers, Mrs. Herbert Snyder, John McKinney, Paul Reed, Russell Lindsay, Morris Wolfe; *Cecil*: D. B. McDowell, J. S. Reisler, R. M. Baker; *Charles*: Samuel C. Linton,

Walter Bowling, Robert J. Martin, Charles S. Smith; *Dorchester*: A. K. Austin, Harold Phillips, Alfred Frosh; *Frederick*: A. M. Etzler, T. S. Anderson, Albert M. Mercer, Eugene Remm, Keefer Martz, John L. Smith, Frank Ramsburg, Morris C. Smith, D. Roy Grossnickle, R. S. Windsor, Stanley Zecker, H. Irving Thomas, Millard S. Smith, Roy Zimmerman, H. Ernest Warner, Ray Warfield, Paul Zecker, Shirley Boone; *Garrett*: Wm. Winterburg, A. J. Richter, Frank George; *Harford;* W. A. Heaps, Arthur Divers, George Richardson, Fred C. Jones, Fred Myers, Benjamin N. Amoss, Wm. McDonald, T. Roy Brookes, Harry Turner; *Howard*: Wm. S. Ledbetter, G. Thomas Clark, Louis A. Randall, H. Jones Baker, Ann Griffith; *Kent*: H. S. Leaverton, B. F. Rash, Edgar Lusby, Herbert S. Ford, W. R. Newman, W. H. Hadaway, Jr.; *Montgomery*: J. D. King, Mrs. Ward Fulton, Ulysses Griffith, IV, Ward Fulton, Joseph Hutton, Wm. Pyles, Mahlon Kirk, Wilson Poole; *Prince George's*: H. C. Townshend, G. S. Oursler, Earl Hoge, Wm. Dean, Wm. E. Duvall, Sr., G. M. McCauley; *Queen Anne's*: J. W. Smith, C. I. Boyle, J. N. Mason, Allan McFarland, Theodore Walbert; *St. Mary's*: F. D. Hayden, J. Franklyn Adams, Paul Bell; *Somerset*: Wm. T. Chaffey, Howard Hayman, Mrs. Howard Hayman, S. L. Betson; *Talbot*: F. A. Schwaninger, Alfred A. Spies, Percy J. Shortall, Graham D. Price; *Washington*: D. E. Rinehart, Joseph Grossnickle, D. R. Snively, Braden King, Donald Warrenfeltz, Ross Gantz, George Stiles, Herman Stackslager; *Wicomico*: C. C. Phillips, John Parker, R. H. Underhill, Merle Collins, Russell Hitch, Clyde Twilley, J. French, Crawford Bennett, S. R. Atkinson; *Worcester*: S. Otis Northam, Preston Downs, R. N. Stagg, C. Vernon Redden; *Assoc. Women of the Maryland Farm Bureau*: Mrs. Clarence Kern, Mrs. Randall Spoerlein, Mrs. Herbert Duvall, Mrs. Leroy Donaldson, Mrs. Norman Shepard, Mrs. Wm. L. McDonald, Mrs. Boone Jarrell, Mrs. V. V. Hughes; *Md. Co-op. Milk Producers, Inc.*: Ross Pearce, J. Charles Rutledge, C. H. Shaw, DeWilton C. Parlett; *Hillsboro-Queen Anne Co-op. Corp*: Henry Whiteford, Charles I. Boyle; *Md. State Horticultural Society*: J. A. Cohill, M. T. Heaps; *Md. State Poultry Council*: Harry H. Rieck; *Md. Tobacco Growers Assn.*: J. E. McCue.

MR. WEAGLY: Mr. Wise will now read the minutes of the last meeting. January 15, 1943.

Same were read.

MR. WEAGLY: What is your pleasure?

Mr. Townsend moved, and Mr. Phillips seconded the motion that the minutes be accepted. Motion carried.

It was moved and seconded that the report of the Credentials Committee be accepted. Motion carried.

MR. WEAGLY: We will now hear the Treasurer's report by Mr. Wise.

Mr. Wise stated that all delegates could have copies of the Treasurer's report. These were distributed and the report presented.

MR. WEAGLY: Any questions?

Mr. McCue moved, and Mr. Chaffey seconded that the Treasurer's report be received and filed. Motion carried.

MR. WEAGLY: We will now have the report of the Audit Committee.

Report read, and upon motion by Mr. Townshend, seconded by Mr. McCue, it was accepted.

Audit Committee Report

January 11, 1944

Mr. President:

Your Auditing Committee met at the office of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc. and checked the Treasurer's Report with the Books and Accounts of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., and find them accurate in every respect. The securities in the bank book correspond with the account.

All bills for 1943 that have been presented have been paid.

The whole report shows a healthy condition of the Maryland Farm Bureau and much credit should be given the management and office force for their excellent work during the past year.

D. B. MCDOWELL, Chairman
S. O. NORTHAM
HAROLD TOWNSHEND
W. T. CHAFFEY

Mr. Claude Phillips gave the report of the Membership Committee, which upon motion by Mr. McCue, seconded by Mr. Todd, was accepted.

Mr. Wise presented the report of the Tax Committee, and Mr. Spies moved it be accepted, seconded by Mr. Tayman and carried.

MR. WEAGLY: We will now have the report of the Resolutions Committee, Mr. Leaverton, Chairman.

MR. LEAVERTON: Mr. Chairman, before I start reading these resolutions I would like to announce that any resolutions made from the floor must have three type-written copies. The Resolutions Committee wishes to submit for the approval or disapproval of this body the following resolutions.

Foreword read, moved by Mr. Leaverton, seconded by Mr. King, and carried.

No. 1, seconded by Mr. McCue and carried.

No. 2, seconded by Mr. Chas. Boyle and carried.

No. 3, seconded by Mr. Chaffey, and carried.

No. 4, seconded by Mr. King and passed.

No. 5, seconded by Mr. Griffith and passed.

No. 6, seconded by Mr. Phillips.

MR. MCCUE: I think that should be changed,—that part about a conservative expansion. Suppose you have a locality where a cooperative is now operating successfully, doing a good job.

MR. CHAFFEY: I think the rest of the resolution takes care of that.

MR. MCCUE: Conservative expansion is not right. I would not specify the cooperatives already existing or set up in the same territory.

MR. HOGUE: I believe if Mr. McCue would read it all. If a cooperative is doing a good job there and we came in, it would not be a "conservative" expansion. I believe that is all right, Joe.

MR. MCCUE: I do not think convervative is right.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think you are making a mountain out of a mole hill.

MR. LEAVERTON: Are you ready for the question?

Motion passed.

No. 7, seconded by Mr. Heaps and passed.

No. 8, seconded by Mr. Linton and passed.

No. 9, seconded by Mr. Reisler and passed.

No. 10, seconded by Mr. McCue.

MR. BROOKES: That word "defeating" in last line of the third paragraph should be "deflecting" should it not? Agreed as to this.

MR. CHAFFEY: I think that word "numbers" in the second line of the first paragraph should be changed. (This change was not made) Passed.

No. 11, seconded by Mr. King, and passed.

No. 12, seconded by Mr. C. Phillips and passed.

No. 13, seconded by Mr. Grimes.

After objection as it was read, Mr. Wise suggested that No. 13 be handed over to Mr. Phillips to re-draft and take up later.

No. 14, seconded by Mr. Townshend.

DR. SYMONS: I am sympathetic with the resolution, but we do not have enough money to carry it out. Perhaps it would be better to re-

quest that we do our best to carry it out. It is a very expensive program. We did not get what we asked for at the latest Assembly.

MR. NUTTLE: How much was asked for?

DR. SYMONS: $125,000 for two years, and we were granted $21,000 for one year. Two or three thousand of the $21,000 was assigned. We will be glad to write to Washington about this. Perhaps the Department of Agriculture would work with the Maryland Bureau of Markets. They are cooperative enterprises.

MR. NUTTLE: I think we had better insert that in the second paragraph,—the third line "Department of Agriculture" before the word "Maryland".

MR. TODD: Would that ask the Department of Agriculture to do the work?

MR. NUTTLE: We would have to have their cooperation.

DR. SYMONS: President Byrd was confronted last fall with a serious problem regarding the stockyards. The farmers went to the Governor and the Governor went to President Byrd, and we had to assign $2,500, or recommend that it be assigned, for that purpose. I only mention that as an illustration. We had a time to find that $2,500, and I do not know where we would find the money for the work suggested here.

MR. WEAGLY: We have a saying up in my section,—if you don't ask you don't get anything.

No. 14 passed with addition suggested by Mr. Nuttle.

No. 15, seconded by Mr. Phillips.

MR. CHAFFEY: I think Irish potatoes should be added to that.

MR. TURNER: I think before adding Irish potatoes we ought to get advice. I think there is a slight difference in favor of the sweet potato. Dr. DeVault put his O.K. on that. I am not against Irish potatoes, but I would like to have some advice about that.

MR. HEAPS: I am not against anybody having a fair chance, but I am wondering if we change that in that way if we would not be opening up a lot of other points.

MR. CHAFFEY: I don't know. I am asking the question.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am inclined to agree with Mr. Heaps. If we add Irish potatoes, then the question might be raised about Idaho potatoes, and Maine potatoes.

MRS. FRY: I do not have a voice this morning, but the sweet potato does have a great advantage over the white potato when you consider its nutritional value. That might be a point.

MR. PHILLIPS: We do not want to do anything to weaken our point. I think more information should be obtained on that.

MR. WEAGLY: Mr. Wise suggests that we pass this resolution, and let the white potato men get together and draw up a resolution and bring up the three copies and let us consider it. They might ask Dr. DeVault about it.

MR. NORTHAM: I talked with them, they are satisfied. Resolution passed.

No. 16, seconded by Mr. McCue.

MR. HEAPS: It has been brought to my attention that the original allocations have been reduced by something like 20%. I would like to know how that works?

MR. MCCUE: In Charles County that allocation was reduced from 13% down to 7%.

MR. NUTTLE: I suggest that the President and Secretary investigate this situation Mr. Heaps has brought to our attention. No. 16 carried.

No. 13 was brought back and passed with addition after "carrying out" the words "a program for the improvement of the Baltimore produce market facilities."

No. 17, seconded by Mr. Nuttle and passed.

MR. WEAGLY: Are there any other resolutions?

MR. BENSON: In view of the fact that this so-called "daylight saving" is such a hardship in harvesting crops, I move that this body go on record as in favor of having it only in the towns.

Mr. Benson was told to bring in three copies of the resolution later, which he did, and upon proper motion and second it was carried.

MR. WEAGLY: Mrs. Kern will now present the resolutions of the Associated Women.

Mrs. Kern read the resolutions, and moved their acceptance. Mrs. Sporlein seconded the motion and it was carried.

MR. TURNER: One of our most active members from Caroline County, Mr. Blackburn, was not able to be with us, and I would like to make a motion that a letter be written him, telling him how much we missed him.

Mr. Linton seconded the motion and it was carried.

The meeting then passed to the election of officers.

Mr. R. F. C. Weagly was nominated for President, seconded by Mr. Hoshall and carried.

MR. WEAGLY: I have been talking a good bit, but I want to say that I appreciate you ladies and gentlemen showing your confidence in me in electing me for another year. I do hope that the experience that I have picked up this year will help me in the coming year, and with your help we will carry on better than we have during the past year. I know we are going to have the help and cooperation of all of the people back home. When I told them how we had to raise our membership, some one said "He is a little fellow to bite off such a big bite", but we are going to chew it.

Mr. Leaverton was nominated for Vice-President, Mr. McCue seconded the motion that the nominations be closed.

Mr. Wise cast the ballot for the organization for both officers, and they were declared elected.

MR. LEAVERTON: I am not going to give you a speech, as I am a very poor talker. I will do the best I can to help out in any way I can.

MR. WEAGLY: I will now ask the Chairman of the Credentials Committee to read the names of the Directors so that they may be confirmed.

Mr. Rinehart read the names of the Directors, and P. C. Turner moved their confirmation, seconded and carried.

Directors of Md. Farm Bureau for 1944

Allegany Co.: Harry Barton; *Anne Arundel Co.*: O. F. Grimes; *Baltimore Co.*: F. Ridgely Todd; *Calvert Co.*: Julius Parran; *Caroline Co.*: C. J. Kern; *Carroll Co.*: Jesse Hull; *Cecil Co.*: D. B. McDowell; *Charles Co.*: Samuel Linton; *Dorchester Co.*: Sam Linthicum; *Frederick Co.*: A. M. Etzler, T. S. Anderson; *Garrett Co.*: Wm. Winterberg; *Harford Co.*: Wilson A. Heaps; *Howard Co.*: Wm. Ledbetter; *Kent Co.*: H. S. Leaverton; *Montgomery Co.*: J. D. King; *Prince George's Co.*: H. C. Townshend; *Queen Anne's Co.*: John Smith; *St. Mary's Co.*: Frank Hayden; *Somerset Co.*: Wm. T. Chaffey; *Talbot Co.*: Francis Schwaninger; *Washington Co.*: D. E. Rinehart; *Wicomico Co.*: Claude C. Phillips; *Worcester Co.*: S. O. Northam.

MR. NUTTLE: I have the folowing resolution of appreciation:

Appreciation

We express our hearty appreciation for the splendid program of the Twenty-eight Annual Meeting of the Maryland Farm Bureau.

We recognize the contribution made by Congressman H. Streett Baldwin, Ben Kilgore, Mrs. Charles W. Sewell, Dr. H. C. Byrd, Brig. Gen. Philip C. Hayes, Charles Milton Newcomb and Dr. H. S. DeVault as an important step in the advancement of Maryland's agriculture.

We especially commend the Lord Baltimore Hotel for rendering their usual fine service and also we appreciate the efforts of the Officers and staff of the Maryland Farm Bureau.

Mr. Chaffey seconded the motion to pass the resolution of appreciation and the motion was carried.

MR. WEAGLY: We would now like to hear from our National Director.

MR. NUTTLE: I appreciate the privilege of serving on the National Board as your representative, and I asked Roy for the privilege of saying a word or two about this ground swell rising from the farmers and showing itself in Farm Bureau membership throughout the United States, not only in Maryland, even in Puerto Rico. I wish I had time to give you the figures in some of the other States. West Virginia increased its membership from 5,000 to 9,000 last year, a man told me yesterday, and they are going up to 12,000 this year. New York State went up to 58,000 last year, and they are still going up. Illinois, of course, leads the way, 100,000, with a membership fee of $15.00, and the 687,000 reported in Chicago will grow to a million or more in 1944. We want you to go home and talk Farm Bureau and tell your neighbors. Let's do this job that faces us in 1944.

Dr. Symons presented the two resolutions, which were seconded by Mr. Linton, and adopted.

Mr. Phillips moved that the actions of the Board of Directors as contained in the minutes of their proceedings since the last corporation meeting be and are hereby approved and ratified. Seconded by Mr. King. Carried.

MR. WEAGLEY: That is about all for the Farm Bureau.

MR. NUTTLE: I want to thank the Maryland Tobacco Growers for those fine cigarettes. Let's all give them hand. I don't smoke myself.

MR. WEAGLY: Tell them to pass cigars next year. I don't smoke cigarettes.

Mr. Benson moved adjournment, Mr. Griffith seconded and the Annual Convention adjourned 12:10 p.m.

RESOLUTIONS, 1944
MARYLAND FARM BUREAU, INC.

Foreword

Maryland farmers have again met the challenge of food production to meet the ever-increasing needs of our nation and its allies. This challenge has been cheerfully met in the face of labor shortages, droughts, inequitable prices in some fields and numerous unnecessary Federal regulations.

The Maryland Farmer has and will continue to contribute his ability, labor and his sons and daughters, to the end that freedom is attained. His patriotism will be demonstrated by work and not by strikes and other measures used by some groups for individual benefit. Farmers will produce food for freedom to the utmost of their resources.

We ask only an equitable sharing in the burdens of war, fair prices in relationship to production costs, elimination of slow-downs and strikes and more sensible and local adminstration by necessary Federal Bureaus.

To this end we will cooperate and make free this land of ours and others from those who tend to destroy freedom from within and without.

Farm Labor

1. An adequate manpower on the farms is the most vital factor in the production of food which is so necessary in successfully prosecuting the war.

During the past year, farmers and their families responded patriotically with long and arduous hours of labor to the nation's call for greater food production. They produced a record acreage of crops and livestock products despite the handicaps of various wartime shortages.

Farmers greatly deplore the danger to the war effort inherent in strikes of organized labor. They likewise deplore both the cost-plus basis of industrial production and the haphazard prices of OPA which prevent farmers from adequately competing with industry for labor.

During 1943, Maryland farm products were harvested and processed with a minimum of spoilage. This was due in large part to the wonderful success of the Extension Service in handling the difficult assignment given on May 1, 1943 for the farm labor program.

1944 presents a challenge. With seasonable weather, to increase food production, more labor will be imperative.

To accomplish this end, we recommend:

1. Adequate prices for farm products so farmers can compete with industry for labor.
2. The AFBF be supported in its efforts to have the Senate pass HR 208 which would provide adequate funds and would place entire responsibility with the Extension Service for the farm labor program, including recruitment and placement of all farm labor and operation of all farm labor camps.
3. Greatest possible exchange of labor and labor-saving machinery between farms.

4. The fullest possible use of school children, volunteer labor from towns and cities, penal labor, war prisoners, conscientious objectors and other similar labor for farm work.

5. That more foreign labor be provided.

6. Increased cooperation with Extension forces in other states to recruit more interstate labor.

7. For all the above types of labor, farmers be given first call during the growing and harvesting season.

8. Cooperation in every possible manner with the USES in providing adequate labor for canning factories.

9. Every effort be made to provide employment on farms for men with an agricultural background returning from the armed services.

10. The state and county labor committees continue to function in an advisory capacity for all agencies and to investigate for state and county Selective Service Boards which have been very sympathetic with farmers needs and most cooperative in deferring essential farm labor.

11. The efforts of all agencies and organizations who have cooperated in the farm labor problem be commended.

Labor Relations

2. We, in Agriculture, have the responsibility of working to preserve national economic stability. We will never achieve unity that will guarantee our way of life and the safety of the nation until agriculture, industry and labor each recognize the rights of the others.

We have no quarrel with the rank and file of labor. We recognize their right to organize and to work for legitimate betterment of their economic and social conditions.

We protest the actions of some labor leaders, who have brow beaten the Administration at Washington by strikes and threats of strikes, which seriously threaten our war effort into allowing unjustifiable pay increases that carry us further along the road to inflation.

We condemn the efforts of John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers, who for two years have persistently tried, with very small success, to organize farmers into his Union. Should he ever succeed in controlling all transportation, processing and distribution and say to the farmer, "Join my union or I will not handle your product", the business man, the consumer, as well as the farmer, will know that we have fought for freedom in vain.

We will support the Inter-State Farmers' Council in protecting every farmer-owned and farmer-controlled organization from interference by any non-farmer group.

A. A. A.

3. Triple A has departed from its original purpose. Objectives of the legislation and successive measures were to give the farmer some measure of control over prices, surpluses and production. Commodity loans, crop adjustment, price stabilization and soil conservation were the foundation of the program. The purpose is sound and with proper administration it is capable of stabilizing the agricultural economy of the nation.

The Maryland Farm Bureau heartily endorsed the policy of the A.A.A. when it was enacted in 1934 to meet the emergency in agriculture at that time.

With the changed conditions in agriculture to meet the nations food needs, we feel that all control measures should be eliminated as contemplated in the act. We believe that subsidies in this program should be eliminated. We believe that the A.A.A. framework should be maintained to meet similar emergencies in the future. Much of the expense of administration developed during the past two years should be curtailed. A small framework of the A.A.A. organization in the state and counties should be preserved to handle war matters of rationing, feed allotments, etc. We urge that this constructive approach toward economy and promoting harmony in relations between our agricultural agencies be presented to Congress.

Bureaucracy

4. We deplore the fundamentals of the bureaucratic set-up which draws the control from counties and states to Washington and leaves the administration of policies oftentimes to those who are not qualified.

Along with our entire economy, agriculture suffers from such a set-up. We realize that our present emergency required this action to a certain extent but we feel that the failure of some of these unnecessary bureaus and their inherent insistence to not only maintain them but enlarge them will lead to a "Bondage" economy and destroy the very thing for which we are fighting.

Taxation

5. We reaffirm our support of a tax program based on the ability to pay, especially the state income tax designed to reduce the property tax. We ask for a continuation of this aid to real estate owners in Maryland. Our farmers are also willing to pay their fair share of a Federal Income Tax. We protest the complicated forms which farmers are re-

quired to use in making out their return. We recommend that one simple form be designed instead of the two or more now required. We recommend that the state and county farm bureaus cooperate in giving every assistance possible to our membership so every protection can be provided our people in filing income tax returns.

Cooperatives

6. We favor a conservative expansion of our present cooperative services, especially in the marketing of farm products. All operations should be on a cash basis. We recommend debt retirement and ample reserves before paying patronage dividends. All associations should budget a definite sum for education and development. We urge the use of the Farm Bureau insurance services by all members and their neighbors, and wider participation in group hospitalization.

Consumer Subsidies and Roll-Backs

7. No policy framed in Washington has so aroused the farmers of the nation as has the matter of consumer subsidies and roll-backs which have been forced upon the farmer, as a substitute for fair prices. Farm organizations condemn subsidies as wrong in principle and deceptive in operation.

Subsidies discourage thrift, destroy initiative and their continued use will tend to take from the American people the protection of the legislative and judicial branches of government.

The take-home wages of American labor are at an all time high while labor spends for food the lowest percentage of income ever recorded in the history of our nation.

Consumers are better able to pay food costs now than they will be to pay increased taxes in the future.

It is absurd for the Administration to point out the excess cash in the hands of consumers and at the same time offer handouts to increase their bank deposits.

Farmers are not asking for an increase in farm prices across the board, but for flexibility to allow adjustments to be made on price ceilings between various commodities.

The real issue is whether consumers are going to pay the entire cost of their food bill today or expect the government to pay part of it out of borrowed funds and pass the debt on to our returning nine million service men and future generations.

We, therefore, petition Congress to block this unsound, uneconomic and inflationary program.

Rural Electrification

8. We are gratified at the rapid extension of electricity to the farms of Maryland in the past five years. Not only does electricity bring comfort and conveniences to the farm home, but in these days when production of food is vital in the war effort, the electrification of farms adds much to the productive capacity of such farms. The War Production Board has recently released a larger amount of copper for extensions and the wiring of farm buildings, also is authorizing the construction of some electric irons and refrigerators. We hope the requirements of war may soon permit a much larger allocation of copper and other materials for such purposes.

We favor and will support:

1. The establishment of a shelf of projects to provide electric facilities and service at low cost, non-discriminatory rates, to many more rural communities and farms as soon as materials and manpower become available.
2. Extended use of electric power on farms now receiving service through development of labor-saving electrical farm equipment and greater use of present equipment.
3. Greater use of electrical household equipment (including plumbing and telephones) in rural homes and encourage development of new appliances designed to eliminate household drudgery and permit better family living.

Farm Credit

9. We endorse the efforts of the Farm Credit Administration to serve agriculture. We recommend a thorough consideration be given to the coordination of all agencies offering loans for agriculture in the farm credit administration. We believe such action would be in the interest of economy and efficiency. We feel that the local associations should retain their present cooperative authority to conduct their own business. That the work of the Bank and Association be so correlated that a minimum of time be required between the request for a loan and the commitment.

Feed and Protein Supplies

10. In view of the short supply of feeds in relation to livestock and poultry numbers, it is urgently requested that immediate steps be taken to insure that available supplies are handled in such a manner as to yield the greatest production of food for the war effort.

Every practical step should be taken to see that transportation facilities are provided to move feed supplies.

We oppose the setting of ceiling prices on corn that ignores the proper relationship between this grain and the price of livestock,

especially hogs. Such action has caused irreparable losses to Eastern farmers by deflecting the usual flow of grain to Eastern markets.

Every effort should be made to increase feed supplies for the coming year by providing adequate experienced labor, additional machinery, and other supplies necessary to obtain maximum production.

Oleomargarine and Nutrition

Farmers are naturally sympathetic to the promotion of nutrition among all people. We know that oleomargarine cannot take the place of butter. We, therefore, protest any movement in Congress to change the taxing system on this synthetic product.

Truck Crops

12. We are opposed to any price ceilings and regulations on fresh fruits and vegetables except when absolutely necessary and workable. If ceilings are imposed, then suitable support prices must be initiated. The regulation attempts to date have decreased rather than increased the acreages of these crops. Faced, as we are, with not only a much higher labor cost, shortage of adequate transportation, higher cost of packages, seeds and fertilizer, in order to do the job at all, we are compelled to use children and such inefficient and unskilled labor it takes three times the number used under normal conditions. We feel that it is essential these ceilings and regulations be flexible enough to adequately protect the producers in the event of short crops due to conditions beyond their control, the degree of flexibility to be determined by the Federal Administrative Authorities of the State working with representative growers of the affected area. The above would simplify the producers problems and tend to increase production in line with the "Food for Freedom" program.

Baltimore Market

13. The Baltimore Market Commission sponsored by the Maryland Farm Bureau and created by an act of the 1943 General Assembly should have the continuing support of the Maryland Farm Bureau in their efforts to survey the situation and to carry out a program for improvement of the Baltimore Produce Market facilities.

Market Information

14. Since there is no check on truck-lot receipts of various commodities arriving in the different markets of the State, it is impossible for the trade or producers to accurately estimate the supply of any particular commodity in any market.

This information is needed by all parties concerned in equitable distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, and for F.D.A. information. There-

fore, we request of the Dept. of Agriculture and the Maryland Bureau of Markets that such data be accurately compiled and available to interested parties.

Sweet Potato Points for Deferment

15. In reviewing the points allowed by the deferment authorities for several vegetable crops we find string beans requiring only three months to grow, yet are given 1 point per acre rate. Tomatoes requiring only four months to grow receive 1 point per acre rate—many other vegetables the same. Yet sweet potatoes are a crop that requires at least 10 months in growing and marketing, taking fully as much labor to prepare plant beds, setting plants, cultivating, and harvesting as it does any of the above mentioned crops. In the face of all this, sweet potatoes require 2 acres to obtain one point or 32 acres for the deferment of one man.

This causes an extreme hardship on the sweet potato growers of Maryland. We most earnestly petition that this unfair condition be corrected and suggest that they be placed on a one point per acre basis.

Farm Machinery

16. Farm machinery has been rationed so closely that not all of those absolutely in need of machinery were able to obtain replacements or repairs last season. Thus, considerable machinery on farms is absolutely beyond repair or in no condition to do a reasonably fair job.

The loss of labor, gasoline, tires and managerial effort makes it impractical to attempt another season without additional machinery.

Knowing the present quotas have been increased, but are yet below the needed supply to enable growers to maintain normal production, we request that the proper authorities be contacted immediately looking toward correcting this condition.

Recognition of Farm Boys and Girls

17. We request the Boards of Directors of the Maryland Farm Bureau and the A.F.B.F. to develop a plan for official recognition for farm boys and girls who have staid on the farm, oftentimes at great sacrifice, financially, socially and emotionally, to carry on the all-important work of food production.

Conservation

18. We urge the Congress to maintain the identity and increase appropriations for support of the U. S. Soil Conservation Service.

Post-War

19. We heartily endorse the State Committee appointed to study post-war plans for agriculture. We urge our county Farm Bureaus to study and submit suggestions for State report.

Day-Light Saving Time

20. We wish to go on record as opposing day-light saving time because of the imposed hardships in farm operations.

Resolutions of the Associated Women of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.

To preserve the way of life that has sought to dignify womanhood, we believe that obligation rests upon women as well as men. Therefore, the Associated Women of Maryland Farm Bureau pledge their effort:

1. To the continuance of the present "Food for Freedom" program in order that the maximum in both production and preservation may be attained.
2. We recommend that farm women study their local school problems to the end that State and National legislation may be supported for maintaining and extending a more effective school system emphasizing the importance of agricultural and home economic courses of study in the public schools of our state with the recommendation that a woman be appointed on that committee.
3. Since the success of Farm Bureau depends to a great degree on its leadership, we, the farm women, must give of our time and talents to maintain and strenghten our existing organization. Therefore, we recommend the formation of many more planning groups which have proven so helpful in advancing our educational and social programs.
4. We recommend that the Maryland Farm Bureau adopt a Recreational Program and sponsor a recreational school to develop leadership in each year's plan of work.
5. The Associated Women of the Maryland Farm Bureau adopt the Resolution No. 12 of the National Organization in its entirety for by so doing we shall have accepted a goal which will take us far toward the accomplishment of our aims and purposes.

Our Pledge:

We believe that obligation for the accomplishment of these aims and purposes rests upon women as well as men. Therefore, the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, as representatives of rural women, pledge to our country:

1. OUR TOIL, without stint; our days—our hours, to help produce the food that is needed to feed America and her allies.
2. OUR EFFORTS, as mothers of the greater share of America's children, to maintain the health, well-being and morale of our families.
3. OUR SERVICE AND OUR SUBSTANCE to carry on in the community those activities that will contribute to the winning of the war.

4. OUR DETERMINATION to preserve democracy on the home front through the strengthening of our democratic institutions.
5. OUR COURAGE to meet the readjustments that need to be made in civilian life. We have long been used to making sacrifices. We shall not be afraid now.
6. OUR FAITH—believing that in turn our country will keep faith with us.

Annual Meeting Maryland Agriculture Society, Lord Baltimore Hotel, January 14, 1944

Mr. Weagly called the annual convention of the Maryland Agricultural Society to order at 11:15 a.m.

MR. NUTTLE: I move the report of the Credentials Committee be accepted as a Council of the Maryland Agricultural Society. Motion carried.

Roll call with following present: *Allegany*: Harry Barton, Mrs. Mabel White, Hugh Stevenson; *Anne Arundel*: O. F. Grimes, W. P. Harrison, Stanley Day; *Baltimore*: F. Ridgely Todd, G. Wm. Sattler, Ross Pearce; *Calvert*: Julius P. Parran, J. B. Morsell; *Caroline*: Clarence J. Kern, F. D. Zeigler; *Carroll*: Jesse Hull, Edwin A. Engler, Luther Hoffman; *Cecil*: D. B. McDowell, J. S. Reisler, R. H. Baker; *Charles*: S. C. Linton, Miss Eloise Gardiner; *Dorchester*: S. W. Linthicum, Reginald A. Jones, A. K. Austin; *Frederick*: A. M. Etzler, T. S. Anderson, R. C. W. Schaffer; *Harford*: Wilson A. Heaps, Thos. Roy Brookes, A. G. Ensor; *Howard*: Wm. S. Ledbetter, G. Cashell Nichols, Wm. Brendel; *Kent*: H. S. Leaverton, F. O. Sutton; *Montgomery*: J. D. King, Ulysses Griffifth IV, J. W. Jones; *Pr. George's*: H. C. Townshend, C. A. King, W. E. Duvall; *Queen Anne's*: J. W. Smith, W. T. Thomas, A. N. Mason; *St. Mary's*: F. D. Hayden, J. F. Adams, T. G. Strickland; *Somerset*: Wm. T. Chaffey, J. Miles Lankford, Howard Anderson; *Talbot*: F. A. Schwaninger, G. B. Rieman, A. H. Spies; *Washington*: D. E. Rinehart, Wm. Hovermale, Joseph Grossnickle; *Wicomico*: C. C. Phillips, S. R. Atkinson, E. L. Williams; *Worcester*: S. O. Northam, Lester D. Shockley, L. L. Colona; *Md. Crop Improvement Assn.*: Walter K. Warehime, Albin O. Kuhn, W. L. Cissel; *Md. Cooperative Milk Producers, Inc.*: J. Chas. Rutledge, C. H. Shaw, DeWilton C. Parlett; *Hillsboro-Queen Anne Cooperative Corp.*: Edwin Warfield, Jr., H. C. Whiteford, C. I. Boyle; *Md. State Horticultural Soc.*: S. M. Fulton, A. F. Vierheller, J. A. Cohill; *Md. State Poultry Council*: H. H. Rieck, W. H. Rice, H. R. Peterson; *Md. Stockmen's Assn.*: R. C. Riggs, J. B. Outhouse, Wm. J. Hines; *Md. Tobacco Grower's Assn.*: C. C. Lee, Geo. Sachse, J. E. McCue; *Md. Vegetable Grower's Assn.*: C. P. Whiteford, W. R. Ballard, Egbert Hawkins; *Md. Nurserymen's Assn.*: Daniel B. Stoner, Paul Hoffman, Henry Hoffman.

Mr. Wise read the call for the meeting:

TO COUNTY SECRETARIES AND AFFILIATE
AND ASSOCIATE SECRETARIES

Notice of Annual Meeting of the Executive Council of the Md. Agricultural Society

Dec. 13, 1943.

Dear Sir:

The annual meeting of the Executive Council of the Maryland Agricultural Society will be held January 14, 1944 at 11:30 a.m., Lord Baltimore Hotel, Baltimore, Maryland.

Blanks are enclosed for you to submit the credentials for the council members of your organization.

Very truly yours,

C. E. WISE, JR.
Secretary
MD. AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY

CEW:MD
Enc.

Secretary read the minutes of the annual meeting Jan. 15, 1943.

Mr. Nuttle moved they be accepted, and Mr. Griffith seconded the motion and it was carried.

Dr. Symons read the treasurer's report and copies of it were distributed among the members. Dr. Symons moved its acceptance, Mr. Linton seconded the motion and it was carried.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT—OCT. 1, 1942-JUNE 3, 1945

Appropriation—Oct. 1, 1942—Sept. 30, 1943, Inc.---------- $2,265.00

Expenditures:

1942

Date	Payee	Classification	Expended
Oct. 29	Md. Farm Bureau, Inc.	Office Rent (Oct.)	53.33
Dec. 8	Md. Farm Bureau, Inc.	Office Rent (Nov.)	53.33
	Md. Farm Bureau, Inc.	Office Rent (Dec.)	53.33
Jan. 27	Firman E. Bear	Travel (State Hort. Meeting)	17.65
	L. C. Carey	Travel (State Hort. Meeting)	4.65
	W. S. Hough	Travel (State Hort. Meeting)	6.20
	G. W. Brown	Travel (Farm Bureau Meeting)	18.85
	E. R. Shank	Travel (Farm Bureau Meeting)	12.35
	P.D. Brown	Exhibit (Charles County)	50.00
Feb. 25	J. M. Smith	Travel (Farm Bureau Meeting)	.75
	Md. Farm Bureau, Inc.	Office Rent (Jan., Feb.)	106.66
March 19	M. T. Johnson	Postage	80.00
	Md. Farm Bureau, Inc.	Office Rent (March)	53.33
April 30	Anna Trentham	Exhibit (Baltimore County)	12.50
	Md. Farm Bureau, Inc.	Office Rent (April)	53.33
May 13	M. T. Johnson	Postage	80.00
	Md. Farm Bureau, Inc.	Office Rent (May)	53.33
June 26	Maurice Leeser Co.	Ptg. (Grange Annual Report)	90.00
	Md. Farm Bureau, Inc.	Office Rent (June)	53.33
July 7	Maurice Leeser Co.	Ptg. (Annual Report)	700.00
	Albin O. Kuhn	Travel (Community Meetings)	124.59
	M. McPheeters	Travel (Community Meetings)	61.71
	C. H. Mahoney	Travel (Veg. Storage)	17.99
	A. F. Vierheller	Travel (Orchard Plans)	29.86
	Salisbury Advertiser Co.	Printing (War-time Folders)	181.50
		Total Expenditures----------	1,968.57
		*Reversion to State Treasury_	296.43
			2,265.00

*Due to change of ending of fiscal year from Sept. 30 to June 30.

This account is audited by the State Auditor.

Mr. Nuttle moved that the same president, vice-president and secretary be elected for the Maryland Agricultural Society as had been elected for the Maryland Farm Bureau and Dr. T. B. Symons be elected treasurer.

Mr. Cohill seconded the motion and it was carried.

Officers elected: President, R. C. F. Weagly; Vice-President, Howard Leaverton; Secretary, C. E. Wise, Jr.; Treasurer, T. B. Symons.

MINUTES

OF THE

Sixth Annual Meeting

OF THE

Associated Women

Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.

January 13, 1944

The Sixth Annual Meeting of the House of Delegates of the Associated Women of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., was held in the Lord Baltimore Hotel with more than 60 members present.

Mrs. Edwin D. Fry, President, called the meeting to order and announced that the theme of the program would be "Work Today to Live Tomorrow". Mrs. Randall Spoerlein led in singing of the National Anthem; the pledge of allegiance was led by Mrs. Jennie Gray; and a devotional service was led by Mrs. Clarence Kern.

Following greetings by C. E. Wise, Jr., Secretary-Treasurer, and R. C. F. Weagly, President of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., the minutes of the last meeting in January, 1943, were read and approved.

A talk by Mrs. Edwin Fry was centered on "Home and Education". She emphasized the important part women play in the home, school and community; how it is their job now, more than ever, to help in the molding, thinking and improving of the child's mind. She mentioned the great number of school teachers that are women; how important is the school environment; and how much is taught in terms of city living and not enough about rural economics. She urged improvement of rural living, that young people will be encouraged to stay on the farms.

Mrs. Fry told the group that it is very important to give more thought to post-war planning. Also, that more than $3,000,000 in cash has been realized in Maryland from Victory Gardens last year, and how necessary it is for the women to continue to help with this work.

Election of officers was held, with the following results:

Directors from districts: No. 1—Mrs. John Flook; No. 2—Mrs. Randall Spoerlein; No. 3—Mrs. P. D. Brown; No. 4—Mrs. Atlee Armour; No. 5—Mrs. Linwood Sutton; No. 6—Mrs. Ralph Shockley.

Voting delegates to the annual business meeting of the Maryland Farm Bureau were: District No. 1—Mrs. Herbert Duvall; No. 2—Mrs. Leroy Donaldson; No. 3—Mrs. Norman Shepard; No. 4—Mrs. Wm. L. McDonald; No. 5—Mrs. Burr Garald; No. 6—Mrs. V. V. Hughes.

The Board of Directors met and nominated Mrs. Clarence Kern for President; Mrs. John Flook for Vice-President; and Mrs. Randall Spoerlein for Secretary. There being no other nominations, the secretary was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for those nominated.

A delegate from each county gave an interesting report of the activities in her county. These reports showed that the women have been very busy during the year 1943, taking on the additional activities that are required during the war period.

The meeting adjourned for lunch.

Afternoon Session

Miss Venia M. Kellar, Assistant Director of the Extension Service, addressed the group. She asked the women to place more emphasis this year on reading and music. She felt that we are singing less now than we have for years. This is a good time, she said, to learn all the folk songs of the Allied countries, and to use these songs along with the Peace program and the nutrition program. Another suggestion was that we learn to cook some of the dishes of the Allied countries, for when the boys come home they will remind us of the type of food they had to eat, whether it was good or bad. Miss Kellar urged the women to take a more active part in Farm Bureau discussion meetings.

Mrs. Ellis, representing Southern States Cooperative, told the women how she could help them get the types of refrigerators, washing machines, and other equipment they would like after the war.

Taking as her theme "Work Today to Live Tomorrow", Mrs. Charles Sewell, Administrative Director of the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, stressed the importance of organization. She told of interviewing members of organizations of different types, from Masons to members of the Window Washers' Union. Each, she said, could give some good reason for belonging to the organization. Everyone works toward a common denominator, Mrs. Sewell declared, to advance, promote, protect, and represent one's business, whatever it may be. She told of the pride in being judged worthy to belong to an organization, and of the fellowship and protection it gives.

Miss Dorothy Emerson, 4-H Girls Club Agent, brought greetings from the 4-H Clubs. She told of the need for local leaders and urged the women to invite the girls to their homes so that they may get new ideas and inspiration.

Reports on the Ninth Annual National Convention of the Associated Women were given by Mrs. John Flook and Mrs. Joseph Parker. Mrs.

Weagly gave a report of the Voting Delegates luncheon, and Mrs. Fry reported on the luncheon for state chairmen.

Resolutions were presented by Mrs. Kern, chairman of the resolutions committee and after approval were sent to the resolutions committee of the Farm Bureau.

Following a vote of thanks to out-going officers, especially to Mrs. Fry for her five years of service, Mrs. Kern, the newly elected president, asked the cooperation of all and with their help pledged her best efforts.

Mrs. Weagly was elected voting delegate to the National Convention for 1944.

MABEL ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary Pro Tem.

Sixth Annual Conference
OF
Maryland State Council
OF
4-H Clubs

January 12, 1944

The Sixth Annual Conference of the Maryland State Council of 4-H Clubs was held at the Lord Baltimore Hotel on January 12, 1944, with Staley Hahn, President, presiding.

M. S. Downey suggested that a committee be appointed to look into obtaining recreaton leaders and training schools. The President appointed a committee consisting of Dan Downey, chairman, Alice Rohrer, Sally Gill, Elizabeth Miller, Doty Remsberg, Louise Brown, and Vernon Bolte.

Following a report of the nominating committee, the present officers were re-elected.

Afternoon Session

The afternoon session began with a dscussion on "Sizing Up the Jobs of 4-H Clubs for 1944", led by Miss Dorothy Emerson and Mylo S. Downey. Three main objectives were offered for the youth in Junior and Senior 4-H clubs, and many suggestions as to how these objectives could be attained.

The objectives were: 1. Develop citizenship; 2. Develop skills; 3. Be equal to any situation that may arise.

The nucleus of suggestons for attaining these goals was:

Develop citizenship by developing community life—learn to live—give yourself the background for good living.

Learn to talk—being able to tell things and to present opinions and ideas.

Learn to have team-work, which promotes learning to give.

Learn to develop your abilities and then demonstrate what you've learned, such as: how to get more done in the same or less time—for example, dish washing, cooking, feeding and milking cows, etc.

Write about discoveries and demonstrations.

Learn to sacrifice, which goes for any and all objectives.

Give club work more publicity, adult backing, and financial support.

Get it across that we are proud of our jobs and of our uniforms—overalls and house dresses. Let the world know that our farmers are doing as much as any other soldiers.

Every older boy and girl must help younger boys and girls attain the same glory as they had, remembering that learning to give is so important, and that if we give, we shall be given unto. This brought out the thought that the Heart "H" is now the most important H. We should keep, or make, our church affiliations strong, so that our spiritual values are not depleted. This, in turn, will show in our homes, where high ideals and loving kindness will dwell. We will have to forget ourselves and win and work for the happiness and the love of helping others. That is our job in this war.

We can be good citizens if we learn about world problems, such as rationing and inflation. We can contribute to such things as bond buying and the blood bank.

Reports on Out-of-State Events—Holmes Baker, Betty Beachy and Robert Galbreath reported on Camp Minewanca, located on Lake Michigan. Elizabeth Miller and Harold Roderuck gave reports as delegates to the meeting of the American Country Life Association. Reports on the National 4-H Club Congress in Chicago were given by Louise Brown and Doty Remsberg.

"What Is Ahead"—The Reverend J. William Merchant, Pastor of Union Grove Methodist Church, Cumberland, gave an inspiring talk on "What Is Ahead". What is needed, he said, is action. We tend to daydream, but get no further. We need to think and act—do something about our dreams. It is vital to think about our world problems—to think and act on the questions "How much are we prepared for peace today?", "Are we ready to sacrifice as much for peace as we are for war?", and, "Who are our neighbors?"

"Daddy Jenks", former State Boys' Club Leader gave a talk in which he urged the boys and girls to ask themselves the question "Can I take it?".

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
Maryland State Horticultural Society
FORTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING
Hagerstown, Maryland
January 5th and 6th, 1944

The meeting opened with the sound movie, "War on Wear", showing methods and importance of proper lubrication of all types of farm machinery.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

STANLEY M. FULTON, Hancock, Md.

I think it fitting and proper that the growers of the State should know something about the organizations that have been looking after their interests and what they have done.

The International Apple Shippers' Association is an organization composed of the producers and handlers of apples in the United States.

The National Apple Institute is an organization representing the growers of the United States and supported financially by the several advertising regionals throughout the country.

Appalachian Apple Service is our own four-state advertising organization known as a regional.

These three organizations have represented the growers in establishing a fair ceiling price, working with War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration.

The first ceiling price that was proposed on apples was in February, 1943. OPA insisted on applying a ceiling at that time, and it was only through the efforts of these three organizations that this ceiling was withheld, returning to the growers a substantial increase over the proposed ceiling price.

Again in July and August, OPA was determined to place a ceiling on the very short peach crop that was then being harvested and again sufficient pressure was brought and no ceiling price was applied on peaches, thus returning to the growers at least $1.50 per bushel above the proposed ceiling price.

About September 15th, OPA was ready to announce the apple ceiling price, which was very much below the recommendation of the apple in-

dustry. Immediately representatives of these three organizations rushed to Washington, and, after conferences were held with War Food Administration and OPA, a compromise was agreed upon that represented a substantial increase in the net return to growers.

As far back as last June, conferences were being held with the War Food Administration with the idea of making possible sufficient quantities of apples for the processors, to insure an adequate supply for our Armed Forces. At that time, a suggested price of $3.00 per bushel was made, which was opposed by the canners in view of the $2.00 price prevailing in 1942. However, through the combined efforts of these organizations, a net price of $3.10 was finally established.

It can readily be seen that our interests have been well looked after and it is the responsibility of every grower to support these organizations that are so necessary. Membership in the International Apple Shipper's Association is $60 per year and the Appalachian Apple Service charge is 1¢ per bushel for all apples, utility and better. We must give these organizations our support.

I wish to pay special tribute to the Extension Service for the fine work they did this past year in establishing emergency labor camps and recruiting labor for them. It was only through the untiring efforts of Paul Nystrom, Mark Miller and A. F. Vierheller, that these camps and this labor were made available.

Indications now point to a more critical labor situation than existed last year, since a much heavier tonnage is anticipated in 1944 with the likelihood of less local help available.

President Fulton appointed the following Committees:

Auditing—G. William Gardenhour; John A. Martin.

Nominating—Lloyd Balderston; William C. Main; Sherman B. Waddell.

Resolutions—E. Dwight McCain; Dwight T. Walker; E. C. McFadden.

PEACH VARIETIES: WHAT'S IN THE FUTURE*

A. L. SCHRADER *and* I. C. HAUT, University of Maryland

This talk on peach varieties is not designed to promote new plantings of peaches, which inevitably follow years of high prices. Rather, in the face of existing heavy plantings of recent years, which ultimately will result in a much larger national crop than we have ever had, it is only common sense to advise growers to limit plantings to replacements. However, in whatever plantings are made, we should take advantage of what is known of the behavior of the newer varieties of merit for Maryland.

---

*Miscellaneous Publication No. 24. Contribution No. 1924 of the Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station (Department of Horticulture).

The recommended peach variety list has been changing rapidly during the past few years and is destined to change even more in the future. Prior to 1920, very little breeding work was in progress with peaches and our peach variety list was composed of chance seedlings that had been found here and there and introduced by nurserymen. Looking at the list of 30 years ago, as shown in Maryland Agricultural Bulletin 159, we find 212 varieties of peaches described in that publication and of that long list the following were recommended for Maryland orchards: Mountain Rose, Early Rivers, Carman, Champion, Reeves, Elberta, Crawford Late, Chairs, Fox, Smock, Salwey, and Bilyeu,—a group of varieties since discarded, with the exception of Elberta. And of the remainder of the 212 under test, Belle of Georgia was the only other variety that is receiving commercial consideration today.

Let us reconstruct a list of 20 years ago. In our recollection, it included largely the following in our Maryland orchards: Red Bird, Greensboro, Slappey, Carman, Mamie Ross, Rochester, Hiley, Champion, Belle of Georgia, Early Elberta, Elberta, Brackett, J. H. Hale, Wilma, Late Elberta, and Late Crawford,—surely not a list to excite a fruit-grower under present-day peach-growing, but again Elberta was a leader among the group, as it is today.

Let us ask why Elberta still holds its popularity and it may give a clue as to what is wanted in a peach variety today, and why so many of the other old varieties fell by the wayside. Elberta does *not* have high edible quality, does *not* have as much hardiness of bud as we would like, but it does have excellent shipping and keeping quality, a firm yellow-freestone, well known to the trade, widely adapted to soils and climate, vigorous in growth, disease-resistant, high yielding, and ripening in quantity during the time of year when home canning is at a peak, although it is not rated very high as a canning peach commercially, and not at all as a freezing peach. To compete with Elberta, any new peach must have all of the good qualities of Elberta *plus* better edible quality, *plus* hardier buds, and must become established with the trade. In short, any new variety has to be a paragon of virtues, including high edible quality (canning, freezing, and fresh), excellent marketability (shipping, storage, name, season, color, size, etc.), high yielding (at least Elberta standard), high resistance to disease and low temperatures, and, finally, wide adaptability to soil and climate. More specifically, the plant breeder seems to be trying to get an ideal that might be described as a yellow-fleshed freestone peach with a small pit, large-sized fruit, high red color, round to Elberta shape but smooth, not oblong or flat, better than Elberta in edible quality, firm flesh with

no stringiness, even ripening, high yield, hardy buds, hardy tree, vigorous-growing of spreading type, a long harvest season, late blooming, resistance to disease (especially bacteriosis and brown rot), resistance to insects, and adaptability to soil and climate.

With present breeding material or even chance seedlings, it is fairly easy to produce a yellow peach of high quality and color, and of early to late season. Too many peaches of recent years have been named and introduced to the nursery trade on this limited basis only to be discarded soon because they fell down on too many other points superior in Elberta. More recently, very good peaches have been introduced which have shown only slight weakness and might have stayed in the running if another peach of the same season had not come along to displace it. For instance, Halehaven took the place of South Haven.

In Table 1, with some of the newer peaches, an attempt has been made to separate the sheep from the goats, or to pick the winners and the also-rans, and to predict some promise from certain newcomers. For designating season of ripening, the older varieties are used as they represent more familiar names and season to most peach growers. Varieties marked with a question mark are the newer ones of promise which look good but have not had sufficient test under Maryland conditions, including Redhaven, Newday, Sunhigh, Early Haven, Pacemaker, and Sullivan Elberta, (the variety Mikado is not new but has a question mark because it is in an early spot with little competition and fills rather inadequately a need for an early yellow peach. It needs a pollenizer, as likewise does Pacemaker).

Varieties marked with an asterisk in Table 1 are good varieties that have failed to be quite as good as the varieties listed as best suited for Maryland conditions. Thus, Raritan Rose is too soft for consideration commercially, although Cumberland (a white peach) also falls down in this respect. Triogem runs small in size unless heavily thinned, and is adapted only to the best of soils. It is hoped that Newday will take the place of Golden Jubilee, as Jubilee commonly develops a soft suture. Goldeneast lacks the bud hardiness of Vedette, and ripens too near to Halehaven season, so that Vedette is placed above Goldeneast. Vedette, of high quality as a fresh peach, also holds the distinction of being the highest in quality as a canning freestone and rates good as a freezing peach. If Sunhigh continues to show up well in future seasons, it will be in the running with Vedette. July Elberta, which is nearly Halehaven season, has shown good size and quality, as well as a vigorous tree, although it apparently is susceptible to brown rot. Summercrest lacks good red color.

It is well to note that a succession of peaches, including Erly-Red-Fre, Cumberland, Golden Jubilee, Vedette, Halehaven, Elberta, and Rio Oso Gem, is furnished by rather recent peach introduction of quality with

TABLE ONE—Selection of Newer Peach Varieties for Maryland Conditions for Commercial Plantings Requiring Truck and Rail Shipments of the Crop.

Season	Before Greensboro Season	Greensboro Season	Carman Season	Hiley Season	Belle Season	Early Elberta Season	Elberta Season	After Elberta Season
Approx. Harvest	July 8–15	July 20–25	July 25–30	Aug. 1–8	Aug. 8–15	Aug. 15–20	Aug. 20–25	Aug. 25–
Top Listing of Varieties and Promising New Ones	Early-Red-Fre Marigold Milkado?	Cumberland Redhaven?	Golden Jubilee Newday?	Vedette Sunhigh? Early Halehaven?	Halehaven Pacemaker?	Redskin Sullivan Elberta?	Redskin Shippers Late Brackett	Salberta Rio Oso Gem?
Next Best and Discard Listing	Red Bird Buttercup	Raritan Rose* Fisher Pioneer Radiance Oriole Delicious Sunbeam Rosebud	Golden Globe Triogem* Fireglow Eclipse Fairs Beauty	Golden East* Colora Red Rose	South Haven Valiant Veteran Red Elberta July Elberta*	Kalhaven Summer-crest Primrose White Hale*	J. H. Hale* Halberta Fertile Hale O'Boy	Afterglow Lizzie Leona Hardee Hardy Elberta

* Good varieties for certain soils and special requirements.
? Varieties that are promising or of limited use.
Compiled by A. L. Schrader, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

the exception of Elberta. Peaches later than Elberta are not favored for planting in most sections of Maryland, on account of trouble with Oriental peach moth. Rio Oso Gem is 10 days later than Elberta, and is a firm, round peach of excellent quality, although the tree is decidedly dwarf in size.

The Maryland Station is now introducing a new yellow peach, the Redskin, which ripens during Elberta season and with its long ripening season, starts ahead of Elberta, so that it might be considered to fill the Early Elberta season as well. If this peach does not develop weaknesses not shown to date, it should prove to be a real competitor for Elberta. The description of the peach is as follows:

REDSKIN—A New Peach Introduced by the University of Maryland

A new yellow, free-stone peach, ripening slightly ahead of and during the Elberta season has now been named and introduced under the name of REDSKIN. Resulting from the crossing of Hale by Elberta, this variety has been tested and fruited under the number Md. 1-15 in several parts of Maryland during the past 14 years, so that its commercial value is now apparent.

The fruit of Redskin is round yellow-fleshed with little or no red near the pit, completely free-stone, firm-fleshed with excellent shipping and keeping qualities, well-colored with a deep red blush even under shaded conditions. The edible and canning qualities have been rated as high. Fruits develop good size even with a heavy load of fruit. High yields have been obtained.

The tree of this variety is vigorous and the buds survived the low winter temperature of 1942-43 along with the hardier varieties. The blossom is large and showy, with a light pink color, and it opens about with Elberta. Leaves are broad and flat with a lighter green color than Elberta.

Trees are not available for planting in 1943 or 1944, but bud wood will be available for propagation in 1944, which can be obtained in that season by application to Dr. A. L. Schrader and Dr. I. C. Haut, Department of Horticulture, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

Looking at the large number of recent peach varieties in Table 1, that have failed to make the grade, it is easy to point out that thorough testing of a peach variety is essential before naming and introduction, and still further testing is necessary in a given locality before extensive plantings are advised or made. Thus, a variety test orchard by an agricultural experiment station, which includes new varieties and standard varieties for comparison, is of perennial value to the orchardist who wishes to save the costly item of planting a variety that will not

Compiled by A. L. Schrader, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

pay, and uses lots of money and time before the mistake is realized. Nearly 200 varieties have been under test at the Maryland Station since 1929, to which has been added many small tests by growers who wanted knowledge of certain varieties under their local conditions. Observations and records on these varieties have been contributed by several other members of the Department of Horticulture, particularly S. B. Chase, and C. W. Hitz. The authors wish to acknowledge particularly that this analysis of peach varieties represents the combined efforts of the men on the project.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that the recommended peach variety list, like the railroad timetable, is subject to change without notice, as new evidence and new varieties come into view. With a flood of new varieties in the offing, the task of evaluating the list ten years from now will be much harder than it is today. Perhaps, in the face of the present greatly increased tree plantings the job will be to recommend not the varieties to plant but the varieties to pull out.

THINNING FRUIT WITH BLOSSOM SPRAYS

L. P. BATJER, Senior Pomologist, Division of Fruit and Vegetable Crops and Diseases, United States Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Md.

With the present scarcity of labor in many fruit sections, considerable interest has been manifested in the use of bloom-thinning sprays on certain varieties of apples as a means of reducing the labor requirement of fruit thinning by hand. One of the chief objectives of these sprays is to thin the crop at blossom time on varieties that normally set so heavily that extensive hand thinning is usually necessary to produce a satisfactory crop from the standpoint of size, color, and quality. Also, if such sprays resulted in sufficient thinning of the crop in the "on" year of biennial varieties, fruit-bud formation for the following year's crop could take place, thus resulting in a crop in what would have been the "off" year.

Kind of Spray. The dinitro-cresol materials, used as a weak blossom spray, have been successful in reduction of fruit set. The sodium salt of dinitro-cresol (Elgetol) has been used most extensively for this purpose, but promising results have also been obtained with less soluble forms of dinitro-cresol.

When and How to Apply Sprays. For best results these sprays should be applied the first day of full bloom. By full bloom is meant the stage at which an occasional petal will fall from the earlier-opening blooms when a small branch is shaken gently. Usually about 90 percent of the individual flowers are open at the full-bloom stage. In the apple, each flower cluster is composed of 5 or 6 individual blossoms. The strongest, or central blossom, in this cluster opens a day or more (de-

pending upon the prevailing temperature) before the lateral or side blossoms. A blossom spray of the type indicated above usually will destroy a large proportion of freshly-opened flowers, but does not seem to injure any of the older or stronger blossoms that have been pollinated for a day or more. Unopened blossoms also escape injury.

For effective results, these sprays should be applied in the same manner and just as thoroughly as any regular spray. It is important to remember that the spray does not kill all the blossoms it hits. Fruit set is reduced by killing a large proportion of freshly-opened blossoms.

Varietal Response. The most satisfactory results with these sprays have been obtained in the "on" year of such characteristically biennial varieties as Yellow Transparent, Wealthy, Duchess, York Imperial, and Baldwin. Results have been too uncertain and generally unsatisfactory on such varieties as Stayman, Delicious, Winesap, Grimes Golden, McIntosh, and others.

Effective Concentration. While no inflexible statement can be made regarding concentration, it is felt that as a general rule the spray should not be used stronger than 0.2 percent of Elgetol (4 qts. Elgetol to 500 gal. water). With trees that are low to moderately low in vigor, somewhat weaker concentrations should be used (2½ to 3 qts. Elgetol in 500 gal. water).

Results Obtained With Sprays. From the practical viewpoint, it is impossible with these sprays to limit fruit set to the exact equivalent of a full commercial crop. With favorable weather conditions for fruit set, in many cases it has been necessary to supplement the sprays with hand thinning. Where additional thinning has been necessary, the amount of labor required to complete the job usually has been less than half the amount required had the spray not been applied. In other cases no additional thinning has been required, the sprays reducing set to such a degree that a marked improvement in size was obtained at the expense of some reduction in total yield. In such cases the spray reduced the set sufficiently, and early enough, on biennial trees with a heavy bloom that a large proportion of the trees sprayed formed fruit buds and produced a moderate crop of fruit the following year, which normally would have been their "off" year. In a limited number of cases over-thinning has resulted from the use of these sprays. This has occurred particularly when unfavorable weather for pollination and fruit set prevailed during the bloom season. Where over-thinning has resulted, however, on biennial varieties, the reduction in the current year's crop would be expected to be more than compensated for by a crop of fruit the following year, which normally would be their "off" year.

Injury Resulting From Fruit-Thinning Sprays. Injury to spurs and spur leaves by Elgetol at concentrations within the limits listed above

113817

has not appeared to be a serious factor. Although some crinkling and mottling of the young, developing leaves has resulted from spray applications, the ultimate foliage system, as a result of reduction in fruit set, has appeared to be as large and as dense as that of unsprayed trees.

General Remarks: It should be emphasized that only a limited amount of experimental work has been done with these sprays, and further testing is necessary before they can be property evaluated. In many fruit sections, however, labor is likely to be critically scarce the coming season, and it is felt that any fruit grower who will likely have an apple-thinning problem during the present emergency should be informed of any development that may help in solving his problem. While the use of these fruit-thinning sprays cannot be recommended generally at this time, with certain varieties the results have been sufficiently encouraging to merit trial.

ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL APPLE INSTITUTE IN RELATION TO GROWERS' PROBLEMS

CARROLL R. MILLER, Martinsburg, W. Va.

A War Food Administration official told me recently:— "Don't expect too much of WFA. We are only one cog in the machinery of today's Government. We pass along our recommendations to other cogs;—OPA, OES, etc. They in turn pass along their recommendations. WFA is only one cog in advance of your growers' association. You tell us what your growers want. We tell the next cog what we want. Appalachian Apple Service is just as much a part of Government as WFA."

That is true: and it is very much worth thinking over. Whether Government remains in democratic hands, or falls into the clutches of the dictatorial and the ambitious, producers of food will always be important;—in numbers, and because of what they produce, food. We can command attention—a good deal of attention—if we organize and build strongly enough.

The day of local government is just about passed. A friend of mine back home, Cecil Wood, put up a strong battle to retain the Old District School Boards. He recognized that the consolidated schools are better in some ways than the old one-room, or two-room schools, but, he said: "School boards are the last vestige of self-government that we, the citizens, have. It is more important that we keep control of our government than that the kids sit in a steam-heated room." He lost his battle. Everything today is moving rapidly, very rapidly, away from individual control, or county or state control;—moving toward national—and now international—controls. President Roosevelt said the other day that he and Stalin had agreed on an international police force.

Wars are an illustration of the trend toward nationalism and internationalism. We used to have small wars. Today, a war started anywhere shortly involves the whole of what we strangely call the "civilized" world. The days of little wars are past, it seems clear, along with the days of county and state government. Today it is national and international, in wars, and government, and all things. That is the trend;—the tide, today.

Old King Canute tried to sweep back the tide with a broom. We fruitgrowers are not fools. Let's not waste our time and energy and money in trying to sweep back the tide. There is only one sensible thing to do, just as engineers do;—harness the tide; turn it into channels which will benefit us, instead of drowning us.

All right;—after this plunge into watery metaphor, let's see if we can get our feet back on solid ground. How can we fruit growers harness to our needs this tide of "government by bureau";— the bureaus being in Washintgon now; a little later on perhaps in Teheran, or The Hague, or Moscow. That doesn't sound good, does it? But we had better look it squarely in the face, for it is the coming order: unless a miracle happens somewhere along the way. The average grower has no chance to influence Government today. It is too big. The juggernaut is too noisy, and moves too fast, to heed the wails of a lone grower, even if individual growers could take out the time, the expense to go to Washington and find out who is who, and cultivate their acquaintance. So from now on, for several generations, the individual can take part in Government only through representation.

Government today means more than just politics. It means Politics and Business. For Government is in Business;—in our business and all other businesses; and will be increasingly;—mainly because we, the people, want Government to come in. We want to be protected from this; to be given that, "without paying for it".

Since Government is now part and parcel of our business, politicians cannot adequately represent us, as in the past. They did badly enough when Government involved only political questions. When it comes to running our business, can a politician speak for us? No. We must speak for ourselves;—each industry for itself; or Government will slap on us controls and requirements that will wreck us. They will do it not through intent, probably; but through ignorance of our needs.

Clarence Cannon, Missouri Congressman who is one of Agriculture's real and powerful friends in The House, told a big assemblage of farmers five years ago something like this:—"I have been on "The Hill" for 20 years, and all that time I have watched the farmer trying to get a square deal at Washington, in competition with other groups. I tell you farmers you will never get anywhere until you do just about as Labor does. Labor tells Congressmen:—'These are the things we want

you to do. If you do them, we will put you back in office. If you don't do them, we will throw you out!' And Labor does just that. They watch the vote in Congress. If the Representatives don't do as they are told, the unions vote against them. And every union man votes. Don't forget that. The Representatives know, and fear, that. They know too that the farmers do not tell them what they want done. And when the Congressmen do vote the farmer's wishes, he seldom knows it or remembers it. He either doesn't come out to vote, with all his family; or gets mad at the Congressman because he is a Democrat, or a Republican, or because of the way he spends his Sundays or something like that and votes against him. That said Mr. Cannon, "is where you farmers fail. And you'll fail until you get together and let your Congressmen know what you want, and reward them with your vote if they do it; and punish them if they don't." That is a rather hard-boiled policy, but it is the hame-string to this job of harnessing today's tide of Government.

Government has grown hugely in the five years since Clarence Cannon told the farmers that. Government today has taken such intimate control of business that the lawmakers no longer can tell us, in laws, what to do and how to do it. Congress merely indicates the direction they want travelled, and provides the funds, and turns the job over to a bureau. The bureau builds its rules as it goes along. So, it is even more necessary than ever that each industry be equipped, through representatives, to tell Washington what it needs, when it needs it, and how to get it. It is just as important to have men on the ground who can see bureaucratic pitfalls being ignorantly dug, and warn us, and Government, of these holes.

Government control means huge opportunities for both benefit and injury. For instance, spray residue;—you remember that some theorists came darn near wrecking us on that. Again, a bunch of Government food theorists said a couple of years ago: "oranges and tomatoes are the necessary fruits. Apples have little if any health value". And they put on a giant propaganda campaign to this effect. This season OPA had its mind fixed on a 7¢-per-lb. "top" consumer ceiling for apples, returning the grower about 4¢ per lb. By presenting the facts effectively, the organized Apple Industry convinced Messrs. Vinson and Marvin Jones that this was too low. The result was a consumer ceiling starting at 9½¢, returning the grower about 6¢ per lb., instead of 4¢. Here's another: Government and the processors were talking $2 per hundredweight for processing grades of apples when we first took up this phase this Summer. The price finally agreed upon was based on $3.10 Instances like these could be multiplied, but these will show something of the possibility for injury, or benefit, in this powerful Government control.

Some other fixed facts about Government controls are showing. None of them are favorable.

1. Government controls must always get tighter.

We have had for some years, in different fruit states and sections, "marketing agreements", under which the growers voluntarily undertake to ship better, more mature fruit to market, and other improvements; under policing of Government. This is an excellent thing to do. The difficulty is that nearby states do not have the marketing agreement and rush their culls into the vacancy. Then the cry goes up:—"This would work all right if;—if we had these other states under the agreement." But any plan like this is only a help; not a complete remedy for success. And as other flaws develop, the justification again is:—"We need more control; or control over more territory." So, the trend in Government control is always, inevitably, toward tighter, wider controls. And Government has found out the easy way to get these controls;—pay the growers well for accepting them. Uncle Sam, for all his social-mindedness, is still very hard-boiled. He holds out shining coin of the realm with one hand. With the other hand, he reaches out for controls;—to enable him to better achieve his laudable purpose of aiding the growers, believe it or not. Let me say here that the majority of Government men are entirely sincere in their beliefs. There are many, many splendid men in Government; some of my best friends; men whom I admire and respect. But we are looking at a picture much larger than the individual.

2. Again;—Government aid is habit-forming; a drug, a narcotic. We found that out very definitely in the governmental "relief" buying of apples by F.S.C.C. Government stepped in, to help us out of a one-season, temporary difficulty. Now, after 7 seasons, whenever we think we see trouble looming ahead in apple marketing, a big group of our growers starts yelling "Let's go down to Washington and get the Relief Program!" They won't face their own difficulties any more. There is an easier way out. And after this war emergency is over, with its $2.76 and $3.12 apples;—when we have a big crop and selling again becomes tough at 90 cents, a lot of our growers are going to think back to these $3 days under Government controls, and start yelling:—"Let's go down to Washington". And Government will be there waiting for them, with open arms. For Uncle Sam has changed. He is no longer the stern, aloof, austere parent. Today Uncle Sam is "socially minded"; a philanthropist, tender-hearted, wealthy. Today he is convinced that no one must be jobless; that every one is entitled to good pay, no matter what he does or how much he does, or whether he does anything; that no group must suffer while any other group has money. And that brings us to another Governmental trait.

3. Government aids the shiftless, and penalizes the efficient. We have had enough experience in packing apples for, and selling apples to, Government for its relief programs, and under this season's one-flat-price ceiling requirements, to know that Government in the apple business

means a slovenly pack. This, continued for a year or two, means sloppier production. That is another inevitable Governmental trend. Government today aids the weak. In aiding the weak, they also aid the shiftless, the ignorant, the lazy. Keeping these people in apple production penalizes the efficient grower, stops progress, rots the whole fibre of the industry. Why worry our heads off when we can force a paternally—minded Government to buy them at good prices, no matter what their real value?

We apple growers can do right well—for a few years—under intensive Governmental controls. We are numerous enough over the nation, and well enough organized to make ourselves heard effectively. We have the political importance and a key product, food. We have demonstrated that. We can force good prices out of government, all right, if we want to take the strong-arm methods required.

Suppose that we do this. Labor is doing it now. Other big farm groups will shortly be doing the same thing;—the grain farmers, the citrus industry, the potato growers, the vegetable growers, the livestock growers. We can *all* force Government to pay us better and better prices, for a poorer and poorer product, just as Labor today is forcing, through Government, higher and higher wages for less and less work.

What will be the answer in, say 10 years? The question needs only to be asked. For one thing, we will "belong", body, soul and mind, to Government:—completely dependent upon them. We will not dare to go "back" to private selling and distribution. For one thing, we will have no machinery to do it with. We are wrecking now our system of distribution. We will have to clutch at the arms of Government, and when we must clutch, then Government has us. And that brings up another important point.

4. As Government becomes established and enlarged, it tends to become just a mass of humans, grasping for power; a political organization within itself. Bureaus and yet more bureaus begin quarreling among themselves over precedence; for more size and power to keep themselves from being swallowed up by some larger bureau. There are bickerings, jealousies, and cold-blooded black-jacking for personal advancement. Government and The Public are pretty much forgotten in this bitter quarreling for personal preference. A few "smart" men disorganize and disrupt a host of good, conscientious men; keep them in fear of their jobs; keep the good men disgusted at such self-seeking and hoggishness. This is happening much too often in our Government right now. It is increasing as Government becomes more and more gigantic. This breeds little Hitlers;—bright men, so clever that they despise the old, slower ways of democracy, and want to impose their own beautiful solutions, Hitler-like, at once. And little Hitlers breed big Hitlers.

Well . . . we are facing Government controls. They mean, among other things, controls that must by their nature always get tighter; control that is remote, and with the power of financial life and death centered in a small group which is apt to become a clique. It means controls that are slow-moving, usually late, smothered in red tape. Government control means "socialization" of the Apple Industry;—uplifting the weak, and the shiftless, lazy, by pulling down the industrious and the efficient. It means lowering quality, and blocking progress.

Government control means destruction of our independent system of distribution; then utter, helpless, drugged dependence upon Government, since no other distribution machinery will be available. It means helping build a machine that will order us around so intimately that political representatives cannot begin to protect our business interests: a machine so huge that it will within itself breed Hitlers;—head-strong, dictatorial-minded men who will, with the machine, have unstoppable power. Those are some of the things that Government control means for us.

I said in starting that Government control, national and international is the tide today; that we must harness it to our benefit. How can we harness Government? It is not complex, but it is hard.

Clarence Cannon's advice is the very collar of this harness. Government has entered Business, to stay. So, Business must get into Government . . . and stay there. We must get business-like with our Government. We must live with, and work with, our Representatives, our Senators, the higher-ups; and with the agents of these, the men in the bureaus. Individual growers cannot do this. It must be done through competent industry representation.

But here is what the individual grower—YOU—and your family must do. You must Vote. Ballot-boxes form the dam by which the tide of Government can be diverted to work for us, in place of drowning us. Tell your Congressmen what you want done, through your association and your representatives;—and then, for heaven's sake, see that he votes as you want him to. If he does, reward him. If he doesn't, turn him out. The "harness" is stiff, tough and hard-boiled. But it works, that has been proved. Shall we use it? Or, shall we become stall-fed cattle, ready for the killing which will come?

THE 1944 SUPPLY OF FERTILIZER

F. W. PARKER, Division of Soil and Fertilizer Investigations,
U. S. Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Md.

American farmers—soldiers on the food production front—are being supplied with increasing amounts of improved fertilizers, just as our soldiers and sailors are being supplied with more and better weapons.

In this respect farmers of the United Nations, and particularly American farmers, have a big advantage over the farmers of the Axis nations.

In 1944, the fertilizer nitrogen supply of the United States will be 30 or 40 percent greater than in any other year of our history. Likewise the supply of phosphates will be greater than ever before, despite the fact that substantial quantities have been furnished certain particular Allies. Potash supplies will be at least 20 percent greater than in any prewar year, but slightly lower than last year. Our favorable position on potash in this war, as contrasted to that in the first World War, is due to the development of a well-rounded domestic potash industry in the last 20 years and its expansion during this war period.

The supply of fertilizer nitrogen materials widely used by horticulturists will be approximately 35 percent greater than in 1943. It will include the normal tonnage of sodium nitrate and a very substantial tonnage of ammonium nitrate produced in war plants. The improved granular ammonium nitrate developed in recent months is an excellent nitrogen fertilizer having fertilizer properties similar to a 50-50 mixture of nitrate of soda and ammonium sulfate. It is commonly known as nitropriles, and is in pellet form, each pellet having been coated with a special wax, then a dust, which greatly prevents caking in the bag. Ammonium nitrate carries 32½% nitrogen. It is slightly to considerably cheaper than some of the other nitrogen carriers, but its increased nitrogen content requires less amount to be used, making it much cheaper considering hauling and coverage. It may increase soil acidity slightly, but at much slower rate than does sulfate of ammonia. There is very little danger of explosion of this material, really no more than with nitrate of soda. It should be remembered that paper sacks in which the material is received, should be burned when emptied, and any cloth or fabric sacks containing ammonium nitrate should be thoroughly washed before being used for other purposes.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

A. F. VIERHELLER, College Park, Md.

This has been a busy year and a lot has happened, only a part of which will be reported. When a reduction in the supply of shortening fats was threatened, the Society was contacted, as less commerical pies baked would affect apple sales to bakers. Action was begun on this matter, but it was adjusted before any protests on our part were necessary. The expected peach ceiling caused considerable work, but it was finally abandoned. Then came the apple ceiling, which called for many conferences, letters, etc., in cooperation with other agencies. We can thank several growers, Appalachian Apple Service, National Apple Institute, International Apple Association, National Apple Planning Committee, and Cooperative Fruit and Vegetable Association, for the

final favorable results in this matter. The apple ceiling is still rather complicated, being among the most confusing of any of the fruit ceilings.

The farm labor situation required much effort by a lot of people and organizations. Your secretary conducted 6 schools for training women workers, and some of these women worked in the peach harvest in creditable manner. Due to drought, the harvest picture changed and labor was not too scarce, but we learned a lot about handling various types of farm labor. There were many conferences and surveys regarding farm labor placement and housing. Other minor matters need not be mentioned here. My thanks go to the Officers and Committees for their fine cooperation during the past year.

As Treasurer, I wish to report a cash balance of $428.41 in the treasury, and request that an Auditing Committee examine the books.

TWO YEARS' OBSERVATION ON THE CAUSES OF "SICK" PEACH TREES

I. C. HAUT, Horticultural Department, University of Maryland

Several years ago the attention of the Experiment Station Staff was directed to certain growing and fruiting troubles of peaches which seemed on the increase in some of the northern Maryland sections. There was sufficient evidence presented at that time to make it desirable to determine immediately the nature of these troubles, especially since reports were coming from some peach sections north of us that new so-called virus diseases, similar in their nature to the old peach yellows and little peach, were gaining a foothold.

Among these new ones was one called "X disease" and another called "red-suture". Since any possibility that certain of these new virus troubles may have found their way into Maryland and could place our whole industry in jeopardy, it was considered very important that the causes for the reported poor growth and abnormal fruiting behavior be determined without unnecessary delay. Through special consideration by our Legislature, the Experiment Station was given funds for a survey and study of the situation and in order that all conceivable angles might receive due consideration, Director Corbett set it up as an interdepartmental study in which staff members from Plant Pathology, Soils, Entomology and Horticulture all took an active part. This paper is a report from the workers on this project which I make as Chairman of this group. We now have two years of study and observation and the situation begins to present a pretty clear picture.

Virus Disease Aspects: Fortunately there has been found no evidence of any widespread dissemination of these new virus disorders. We have found occasional trees with symptoms which could be of an unrecognized

virus character. Altogether, about nine such individual question marks have been located and in every case we have taken buds to College Park and inserted them in healthy seedling stocks in an isolated block. Thus, it will be possible to determine whether the trouble is transmissible and hence of a virus nature. To be absolutely sure these must be allowed to come into fruiting and we plan to set out four or five budlings from each "suspect" and carry them into the fruiting stage. This will also give us another clearer check on such symptoms as may develop, because in several instances it was difficult to be sure there was a disease symptom involved because the tree was already in very poor condition because of root exposure from soil washing, borer attack, etc. However, in each instance where there was a reasonable doubt we took buds to be safe. Notwithstanding, we accumulated less than a dozen of such "suspects".

A word should be said about two of our old-time virus troubles of peach, namely yellows and little peach. We can always expect to have occasional trees in an orchard show up with one of these. The experienced orchardist immediately takes out such a tree as it shows up and keeps things under control. However, in two cases, one in Washington County and one in Howard County, we have found blocks where the ordinary yellows had gained considerable headway. Both were small blocks where orcharding was not the main interest but a sideline, with dairying in one case and poultry in the other being the main farm operation.

Several semi-abandoned orchards have also been encountered which present a menace. It should be emphasized that on the whole there is no widespread trouble. Practically without exception, yellows has been found only in smaller blocks operated by people who are not full-time orchardists and, fortunately, these are of limited number. Nevertheless, a word of caution must be given. There is an attitude of laxity among our established orchardists as regards yellows. There is no reason to worry about things getting out of hand if we will continue to take out immediately the tree here and there which shows trouble. We do have cause for worry if we ever get carefree in our attitude. The reason given by several growers for not removing trees spotted for them is: "I don't have the time". This amounts to the same thing as saying, "I don't care if it takes out my orchard".

Most of the peach tree losses, in some cases of serious proportions, have been found to be due to cultural problems. Considerable time has been given to these angles and the relative importance of each in accounting for poor growth or outright losses varies with every orchard, so no one of them can be considered as the single most important one. Usually several problems go hand in hand in causing trouble. There isn't any order of importance. I'll give them as I go along and briefly try to hit the high points about each one and later try to tie some of them together.

Lack of Borer Control: It is not lack of application but lack of control from the application made. In many blocks control has ranged from poor to no control. Yet in almost every case the material has been applied concientiously. Apparently, the reason for poor control is most frequently lack of timeliness. Generally we are applying the material *too late*. Insufficient help the past several years has undoubtedly played a part in this. Growers with considerable Grimes and Jonathan apples to harvest have been doubly handicapped in getting the borer work done at the time it is really effective. Occasionally, mounds haven't been removed and this leads to poor control. Killing borers is in one respect much like killing codling moth—putting on the material does not in itself make certain you will get the worms. But, in moth control we see the results of our control efforts and with borers we don't, unless we make a special check-up on it. I believe it is very important to make a careful check-up of results each year.

Over-deep Planting: This has proved a cause of trouble, especially on sites with heavy or impervious subsoils, or on terraces. We have found cases where a foot or more of the trunk of each tree has been buried. Tree losses have been heavy almost without exception, particularly where a heavy clay or tight sub-soil lays underneath. The peach will not scion-root (throw out a new root system from the stem tissue) as some apple varieties do rather readily. It can't form a new root system higher up where conditions are more favorable, so the tree is simply smothered out. The base of that tree (the point from which the main roots go out) is set in a bottleneck from which there is no escape. The period when such trees pass out usually falls between the second and fifth years.

There is a second factor which accounts for increased tree losses as a result of planting too deep. With the restricted dosages which can be used safely for borer control on young trees, gas penetration on heavier soils is not sufficient to kill those borers working low in the trunk, resulting in a high mortality in young trees after two or three years of such uninterrupted borer activity.

In either case, the solution lies in not planting so deep. Let the point of bud union remain above ground in planting and, if the trees were budded quite high in the nursery, split the difference when planting. This will still put them two or three inches deeper than they stood in the nursery and that is plenty deep enough on any soil. The roots will develop quickly in that soil depth which from the standpoint of aeration, moisture, fertility, etc. is most favorable for their development.

Terraces. Some of our trees are much too deep because of the system used in building the terraces. The method formerly used was to plant the trees on the contour and form the terrace afterward by throwing up furrows against the trees from each side. From the engineering

angle this seemed a very practical way, but in many cases it has left the trees standing much too deep. When set on the deep side, with this practice following, we have found trees having as much as 18 inches of trunk in the soil and the resulting mortality in such cases has been very high. Under no circumstances should growers be persuaded to follow this practice in forming terraces. *Build your terrace first; make sure it is high enough to do the job and allow time for settling before the trees are set.* In other words, the terraces should be finished in the fall for spring setting or in the spring previous to fall planting.

A second reason for tree losses in connection with some terracing is because of poor drainage. Unless we have a *very* deep soil or an open gravelly or sandy subsoil, so that we have good under-drainage, it is essential that sufficient slope be allowed to take off excess water in a reasonable length of time. In northern Maryland we have many peach trees on soils with a heavy clay or very tight subsoil. On such soils we have found water standing for weeks above terraces which are on the level or with slight slope, especially during late fall and periods during winter or early spring. The result has been suffocation of the root system with trees dying the next year or year after. *However desirable it may be from the standpoint of the ideal to save every drop of water that falls, it is obvious that practices designed to accomplish this must fall short of producing dead trees.* If this should require that we accept somewhat less water than that which it is possible with engineering skill to hold, there is no alternative. Furthermore, we must not forget that peach trees are just as susceptible to injury from wet feet in the winter as they are in the summer.

What constitutes an adequate slope is an engineering feature differing with each soil and site, but from the standpoint of a grower I would like to point out two things as regards terraces on sites with poor under-drainage: first, that it is both impracticable and impossible for a grower with modern heavy implements to keep a terrace channel so perfectly manicured that a one or two degree slope will function adequately in carrying off surplus water and not leave pockets of standing water along the terrace, and, second; a heavy cover crop, the kind we are desperately striving for on such soils, will slow up or impede water movement, especially in the early spring.

A third angle in relation to terracing which accounts for some of the trouble is again associated largely with the shallower soil types just referred to; in this case with or without a tight subsoil. If terraces are constructed for every other row only (or on every third row), and much of the top soil is taken from in between to form this terrace (more likely where comparatively high terraces have to be made), then the trees set in the rows falling between the rows on the terraces are forced to develop on more or less subsoil. If this subsoil is heavy or impervious, the results are so much the worse. The trees start slowly, develop

smaller size and with the first heavy crop in a dry year some trees die out and we have a spotty row with missing trees. If the site was one from which the top-soil was already somewhat depleted—indicating the necessity of a terrace system—the need to exercise care concerning this point becomes so much the greater. Heavy mulching of such rows with strawy manure would partially alleviate this situation, but to have to start that way is a makeshift at best. Also, sufficient mulching material is usually unobtainable for large blocks and it would be far better to make different plans or adjustments when laying out the orchard, or better not to plant such a site at all!

This review of some of our soil and terracing problems in relation to tree growth may give the impression that I am lukewarm to the idea of terracing in general. Let me stress that that is definitely *not* my intention. I'm sure we are all whole-heartedly committed to the broad program of conserving our soil. However, the engineering skill of our conservation men has progressed so far that they can make water stick to anything but the completely vertical. Unfortunately, this alone does not assure profitable peach production. However, when this is done it is an admission that the site will not grow fruit without a major operation. Whether or not after the "face-lifting" the site is any better or remains as satisfactory for the successful growth and economical production of peaches must be given more consideration by both the conservation specialists and the grower than has been given it. Many of the earlier mistakes concerning details of the later planning and setting of such sites are now recognized and are no longer being made. They were "pioneering mistakes" which required experience to clarify. Nevertheless, some of these earlier methods account for certain of the tree troubles and losses which have shown up in the last several years in young blocks and about which growers have been concerned and have asked for explanation.

Close Planting. This has definitely been a partial factor accounting for trouble in old blocks. We still have more closely planted old blocks than we realize. Many trees are standing 14 x 14; 14 x 16; 16 x 16, etc. Every drought period hits these trees progressively harder as they become older. The tops begin to crowd badly, and if we try to invigorate the trees by using more nitrogen, we get a dense canopy and very poor color, so nitrogen is reduced or avoided entirely. Actual instances could be cited where extra potash was applied in the hope it would help by substituting for the lack of nitrogen which of course it won't do. The pruning can't be changed to help the color problem because if the trees are opened up we can't get through with the sprayer—or anything else. As the trees become progressively weaker, bark beetle shows up; the normal damage from borer cannot be as quickly repaired by the tree; our normal arsenic spray causes arsenic injury on the leaves; and the spiral of devitalization moves ever downward. Removing part of the trees is the only remedy. Fortunately, we have but few younger blocks

set so closely, yet there are several set 16 feet or less and their history after the first dozen years or so can be expected to follow this same pattern.

Malnutrition. All of the angles on peach nutrition as it pertains to our more shallow stony soils have not been cleared up. In some preliminary trial plots we have obtained very marked improvement in growth of older trees from manure and complete fertilizer deeply worked into the soil, even though these trees had been receiving six pounds of nitrate of soda or 10-6-4 mixture each year. It will take more study before we know which of the elements have accounted for most of the benefit. It is clear, however, that on some soils, especially the shallower, stony soils with heavy subsoil, we have not always had the expected response from our past fertilizer practices. We enlarged on the work this year and will have a better understanding of these points in another year.

Cover Crop Management on Shallow Soils and in Relation to Drought. Two points under this heading must receive more attention. *First, we have to get this cover crop growth at a time when it will least compete with the trees for moisture.* This calls for a crop which will grow satisfactorily during fall and early spring under cool temperatures. Also, we must get this crop sown sufficiently *early* in the fall so it can become well established and make good growth before winter. Our long-used winter rye or the rye and vetch combination planted early is still one of the best in meeting these requirements. These must be seeded before the middle of September or we lose greatly in the benefits we can get from them. On these shallower soils, usually stony or shale, and in sections afflicted with dry spells, we should turn down the cover by the middle of April and only in the most favorable spring as regards ample moisture should it be held until May 1. Growing the cover any later in most years will be directly in competition with the trees for moisture. It will use more water than will be compensated for by any additional organic matter which is produced. Moreover, such a crop usually will provide adequate dry material, provided it is planted *early* in the fall and provided the cover itself is *adequately* fertilized. Occasionally, this material will not have become quite as woody as we would like, but get it down anyway. We can make up for such conditions by allowing the cover to develop fully in years when moisture is ample, or in years of crop loss from winter injury to buds or from a heavy spring frost.

A second point should be stressed concerning the need for fertilizing or in some cases applying lime to the cover. If we get only half the organic matter from an unfertilized cover crop, the cost of seed and the cost of turning it down (fixed costs) are increased and it is really false economy in the long run. Moreover, fertilization will help us to get this cover crop growth when it is in least competition with tree growth.

Some of the more recent covers are very desirable in certain respects, but fall short in other ways. Among these, Italian rye grass should be mentioned. It makes a large fibrous root system which holds the soil very well. However it does *not* make much top growth in *cool temperatures* of fall and early spring, with the result that it is grown into late May or even June some years, in order to get adequate tonnage of woody material. This is positively too late for the soils being here considered, and holding Italian rye grass too late has been a contributing factor to poor growth and small size of fruit in several instances during recent drought years. There is one point of view which holds that we don't need to wait until we get a lot of top growth before putting down this particular cover because a big part of the total weight of the plant is found in its extensive fibrous root system.

This root tissue is high in moisture, however, and does not represent a great quantity of dry matter, and more important still, what we do get is not highly lignified material and hence burns out quickly in the soil. There is a place for Italian rye grass on steep slopes of real deep soil or where the rainfall is always ample during the growing season and the real problem is one of holding this water only, and the matter of it stealing water from the trees during critical periods of moisture doesn't have to be considered. Except for such cases, it is not recommended as a cover for peach orchards in Maryland. These statements are being made regarding normal times. Due to shortage of some of our cover crop seeds, it is obvious that for the duration we must do the best we can with whatever is available.

Mouse Damage. Only one point needs to be mentioned here. Diagnosis of this trouble by the grower has been overlooked at times because frequently the damage does not show in the appearance of the tree until the second season after the damage was done. In other words, damage done this past fall or winter may not show up until a year from next spring as far as leaf appearance and top behavior of the tree are concerned. The reason is that if the root system of the tree was heavily supplied with food materials when the tree was girdled (more likely true if the growing season previous to girdling was unusually favorable for food manufacture, or the trees were without a crop), this food reserve may be sufficient for continued new root growth for quite a long time. Once this reserve is exhausted, no new root absorbing cells can develop and as the root cells functioning in absorption become corked over, no further water can be taken up from the soil and the top collapses. The more limited the food material in the root system at the time the transportation of food from the top is cut off by the girdling, the quicker this final stage is reached. Wilting of the leaves during warm days when there is plenty of moisture in the soil is almost a certain index that either the bark below ground or the roots, or both, are severely injured.

In conclusion it must be said that because we are still in the clear as regards these new virus diseases we cannot relax our vigilance regarding them. All fruit growing experience teaches us that most of these troubles tend to spread gradually from restricted areas in the beginning to wider areas later. The picture can change quickly with these virus troubles. Neither can we relax our guard against our old-time enemy, peach yellows. Among a few of the part-time growers there is a rather carefree attitude about yellows. No doubt the fact that the peach block is merely something being carried "on the side" partly accounts for such a point of view; inexperience is also a factor.

We have not encountered any real evidence that disease trouble of these types has been brought to the orchard on nursery stock. However, if the present shortage results in much material being brought in from distant areas or originating with indiscriminate producers, the story may be a different one several years hence. Also, for some of such trees we shall undoubtedly have to select new and uncomplimentary names when they come into fruiting unless we recognize them as some of those which grandfather had in his orchard.

This in a general way covers the factors we have encountered which are responsible for the poor growth or spotty conditions showing up in some of our peach orchards. Most of the conditions here reviewed are fortunately within the control of the grower, except in those cases where orchard site and soil are unduly unfavorable. We hope to study certain of these angles further in order to better advise the grower on the most practical ways of handling some of these difficulties.

APPALACHIAN APPLE SERVICE AND NATIONAL PEACH COUNCIL PLANS FOR MARKETING THE 1944 CROP

CARROLL R. MILLER, Secretary-Manager, Martinsburg, W. Va.

As a guide to what Appalachian Apple Service and National Peach Council expect to do next season, let me review briefly, the jobs done the past season:

Some of you Maryland growers, who are closer to our central office at Martinsburg and attended the meetings we called the past two seasons to discuss acute problems in marketing our apples, may have noticed that the final stand taken by the apple industry nationally and the results finally achieved in Governmental price schedules and arrangements, followed very closely indeed the recommendations which Appalachian Area growers made at our meetings.

For instance, when ceilings were finally thrust upon us, by Government's call for the meetings at Charlotte and other points to discuss ceilings with OPA, Appalachian assembled some 50-odd growers, on April 14th. At that meeting, after an all-day discussion with Govern-

ment men whom we trusted, and with wholesale apple distributors and the processors, we took the definite position that:—

1. We wanted no ceilings, because they are not practical with perishable fresh fruits.

2. If ceilings had to be, we urged the simplest ceiling,—a single national ceiling, placed where the consumer buys; high enough to encourage production, since heavy production is, in the long run, the only cure for too-high prices; and a ceiling low enough to protect the consumer against being gouged.

This position was taken, a little later, by the entire apple industry, through National Apple Institute and National Apple Planning Committee. On that platform, we met *repeatedly* with WFA and OPA. The actual price was left open until the season had fully shaped itself, so that we could determine costs, etc. On August 25th, the Planning Committee met at Washington and agreed that a single "top" ceiling of 12½¢ per lb. was advisable, under existing conditions.

Let me re-call that OPA had previously made up its mind to a "top" ceiling of 7¢ a lb. WFA battled for 10¢. The two agencies, who must agree, compromised on 8½¢; to net the grower about 5¢ per lb.

It looked as though that 5¢ might be below the cost of production, especially for the many growers with less than one-half crop. The Apple Industry swung into action right then. And the Apple Industry is organized now so that it can swing into quick action. President Reuben Benz of National Apple Institute personally led the fight, right in Washington. He went straight to the top; blasted out a promise of a session with Judge Fred Vinson, Economic Stabilization Director. He called in Appalachian, and some well-chosen Representatives. Senator Byrd attended. We spent one afternoon on a dress rehearsal and the next morning went before Judge Vinson with an effective delegation.

That conference was followed up vigorously by another similar meeting before War Food Administrator Marvin Jones the next day. The net result of the two meetings was that Judge Vinson ordered OPA to add 1¢ to the 8½¢ ceiling; of which the distributors got one-third; the balance, 32 cents per bushel, going to the grower. OPA has been irritated ever since at Judge Vinson's order; but they came out with ceilings starting at 9½¢ a lb. "top", and 5¾ cents minimum to the grower; instead of 8½¢ and 5¢ per lb. to the grower. It was estimated by OPA that this 1¢ added over twenty million dollars to the selling price of the national apple crop. Actually, it cost the average family of the United States about 50 cents more for their entire year's apples;—about a dime per person. It secured cost-of-production for all growers in this Applachian Belt except those with less than 1/3 of a crop. The ceiling for oranges has been set, to average 9½¢ per lb.; so that our apple ceilings are just about in line.

Price ceilings on "fresh" apples were only a part of the job this season. Appalachian Apple Service in 1942, by timely meetings of growers, processors and Government men, took the lead in shaping policies and establishing satisfactory prices for processing apples. Again this season, we started on this early and kept at it actively. On July 8th we called the first meeting; had about 65 growers, processors and WFA men. At that meeting, sentiment crystallized that the basic price for processing apples should be $3, or thereabout. An Industry Committee of both growers and processors was appointed.

On July 28th, this Industry Committee met at Washington with Government men. Processors and Government both were still thinking in terms of $2 per cwt. They were still using that figure. The growers told the meeting that theories and schemes would not bring apples to the canners; that only a fair price, in relation to open market prices, would do the job; and that the basic price would have to be at least $3. As you know, we made the point stick. The price schedule as finally issued was on the $3.10 per cwt. base.

The results justified the growers' price position. Canners in this Appalachian Belt have or will put up this season over half of their last season's record-breaking pack. The crop over the Belt averaged just about one-third of last year's. So the processors got a much higher percentage of the crop than they did the year before. Compare this with results in peaches in Washington State, where WFA slapped on a $60-per-ton ceiling at the processing plants, and a "set-aside" order, over the protests of the growers that this would not cover their extremely high cost-of-production. But price and set-aside order together only got the Washington canners about one-half as many peaches as they got last year, Washington growers tell me, although the crop was about the same in size. In apples, WFA accepted the growers' judgment, and came out well. The peach section of WFA disregarded the growers' judgment and lost out; and in addition, now have the distrust and dislike of the growers. We apple people are particularly fortunate in having men like Carl Wooster and Ralph Headley in WFA, heading up the apple section.

I mentioned at the start the rather remarkable way in which Appalachian Apple Service, through its membership, has shaped and influenced national apple policies. In one way, it is remarkable. In another way, it is only common sense. When a new apple problem comes up, this Association secures and passes along to its members all the information it can get. Then, we call together a goodly number of our members; those most interested in the particular problem. When a good big group of experienced men get together, and discuss the thing for a day, the right answer usually comes up. That explains our success, in part. The *other* big part is that the Apple Industry is so well organized now, under such competent leadership, that the "right answer"

can be placed before the Industry in an effective way. When you have the right answer, and the right machinery, the result is fore-ordained. "Right machinery" means, of course, the National Apple Institute and its co-partner, National Apple Planning Committee; both of which are co-partners with the "regionals"—such as Appalachian Apple Service, Washington and Michigan Apple Commissions, and New York-New England Apple Institute.

The apple industry, in fact, is organized so well that both the citrus and the potato industries, after Judge Vinson's decree of another 1¢ to the apple ceiling, immediately began to work toward national associations for their own industry. It remains to be noted here that Appalachian and the regionals are the only financial support of National Apple Institute. From thirty years of trial and error, it has been found that growers' organizations must be built "from the grass roots". The agency which spends the growers' money must be close to the grower. Contacts must be direct. Unless they are, the grower loses contact, and interest, after a year or so; and the organization falls. This happened a number of times in apples, between 1912 and 1936. About 1936, the growers organized regionally;—in the Northwest, in Appalachian and in New York-New England. Organized on this "grass-roots" basis, every one of them has lived, and prospered. So, the rule is established that you can aid the national organization only through the regionals. To those of you who are not members of Appalachian Apple Service and The National Peach Council;—who are not carrying your share of the cost of this work—we extend a hearty invitation to join up.

The work on apple ceilings and apple diversion orders and prices has not been all of our work this season, by a good deal. But we are only going to mention our other, more established jobs. We are keeping apples before both the public and the retailers, against the coming years when we will need customers desperately. We are getting out our regular monthly Apple Recipe Service, with 64 daily newspapers co-operating. We have this season again garnered a goodly share of apple publicity through feature articles in magazines and dailies. Our apple movies are circulating constantly. We are continually supplying photographs and data for apple articles, to the Press, for text books, for the Radio.

We have kept up a steady contact with retailers, too. We don't want them to forget about apples. We mailed 60,000 special cut-out cards, an 8-inch apple in full color; sent a different one each week for 4 weeks to 15,000 grocers over the East, Midwest and South. We have sent out some thousands of the 1943 Grocers Apple Book; and several thousand of the Distributor's Apple Book. Every day we fill requests for our two consumer booklets;—"Apples; Their Home Use" and "Design for Eating".

We ran into a most unusual happening. We happened to contact the great General Mills' advertising-promotion people when they were

making up their Fall-Winter advertising schedule. They became interested in seeing what could be done with a tie-in campaign on WHEATIES, their "breakfast food of champions", and apples. They wanted to know what help we could give them. We got the other regionals interested, and the net of the story was:—$86,000 worth of newspaper white space and radio time; plus the efforts of their 400-man field crew working with grocers. This $86,000 did not include costs of talent teams on the radio, nor the art work for newspapers. Total of all these costs, including their fieldmen, would run well over $100,000. It was the biggest tie-in advertising campaign ever staged with any fruit. The Sunday papers on September 19 and 26 carried a full page in colors "4 Exciting Ways to Eat an Apple". General Mills carried the ball for us in the very important job of getting people to eat more apples fresh, instead of cooked. Our real money comes from the sale of Fresh apples, so that is important to us. The campaign went over beautifully. There was only one trouble. There weren't near enough apples to go 'round.

But between the different regionals, we gave General Mills such good support and aid that they were much pleased; and are ready to go back into it again when apples once more become a drug on the market.

I am taking too much time. I shall only list a few other important things that Appalachian either did, or had a big hand in helping along:—

Keeping "ceilings" off the early "Summer" apples.

Getting ODT to cancel for Summer apples its 5-tier loading rule.

Easing Selective Service's rule that only 1 man was required to work 32 acres of non-irrigated orchard.

Getting exemption or deferment for individual growers and their help.

Getting gasoline for spraying.

The list could be made much longer. Five hundred growers need a lot of things, in a hectic twelve-months such as this.

What does Appalachian, and National Peach Council, plan for the coming season? Well, we *may* have 80 million *more* bushels of apples and peaches this year than we had last year. Dr. Magness talks of 140 or 150 mililon bushels of apples;—52 million bushels more than in '43; and there probably will be 70 million bushels of peaches, against last year's 42 million.

The present wartime, abnormal demand for food will remain high. Even if Hitler shoots himself, and the Germans quit, we still have the yellow sons of . . . heaven, they call it . . . to finish off; and a whole lot of the world is not self-supporting and won't be for some time. The

American pocketbook will continue fatter than it has ever been before. So, even these bumper crops will doubtless be absorbed at fair prices IF—if the Trade and the Public know they are coming and are ready for them.

But, remember that the Public has been getting along for months now on few or no apples; and that the Public forgets quickly. Remember that the Trade has built itself up in other fruits. Next fall, the Trade will cast back over the quantity of apples they bought this season, and will say.—"I guess we'll be needing about a truckload of apples now"; where after 1942's big crop, they would have used 10 truckloads. Habit is strong. The Public will tend to think the same way.

We must organize the Trade;—the jobbers, the retailers, and the Public, to be ready for the flood; particularly in peaches. That 10-week marketing season doesn't allow for any false starts. If the retailers know the peaches are coming, and when they are coming, and what varieties; and can get their canning supplies and make their special sale plans, even 70 million bushels of peaches should move out nicely. If the Trade and the Public are not ready, there may be a jam that will be very, very expensive. OPA will have some odd ideas about ceilings for the coming season, too.

Getting the Trade and the Public ready for our peaches and apples; and getting fair ceilings out of Government for the coming crops;—these plus our usual work as outlined, will keep us busy.

KEEPING AHEAD OF MICE IN THE ORCHARD

JOHN N. HAMLET, Rodent Control Specialist, U. S. Fish and Wild Life Service, College Park, Md.

The best method to control both pine mice and meadow mice in orchards is a poisoning operation. Research men, after several years of work on this problem, have found that the most successful control may be reached by use of a rodenticide in which zinc phosphide is the toxic agent. In food habit studies it was found that apple was the best carrier for this rodenticide.

It must be remembered that there are usually three or four kinds of mice inhabiting an orchard, but usually there is only one kind that harms the orchard trees. From Central Maryland south, it is usually the pine mouse that does the damage, an extremely short-tailed small individual that spends most of its time underground. North of Central Maryland, the meadow mouse, another short-tailed variety, begins to make itself known by its many runways and trails through the grass.

To control these mice, it is necessary to place the bait so that the mouse is forced to come in contact with it. In the case of the meadow mouse, that would be in the runways or trails on the surface of the

ground. In the case of the pine mouse, the bait must be put into the surface holes or in the underground tunnels to obtain best results. This placement of bait is made easier and more effective by use of concentration stations.

For the control of pine mice in orchards, the first and most important step is the placing of concentration stations. Without these stations control practices are laborious and inefficient. In using the best technique known today for control of this pest, these concentration stations are an absolute necessity. Not only are they necessary for good control, but they are labor-saving to the orchardist.

The best type of concentration station is two-ply roofing paper cut 18 x 18 inches. Once placed in the orchard and handled with any degree of care these stations should last at least four or five years and probably longer. The cost is two cents per square, the roll can be cut at the nearest lumber mill or by hand, as desired. There should be one such station at each tree, but if the orchardist does not care to cover his whole orchard the first year, he should pick those blocks of trees that have the highest population of mice.

There are two methods of putting out concentration stations. One method is to place the stations under the trees at random with no thought of looking for underground runways of the pine mouse. When using this method the tar paper square should be placed away from the trunk under the overhanging branches—that is on the circumference line of the tree top or drip. Always be sure to place a piece of sod, or better yet, a rock on the station to hold it down. The orchardist must remember that when the above method is used it will usually be two or three months before these stations will be found and used by the mice.

The other, and more practical method, is to place the stations over disturbed runway systems. The runways may be found by noting the exterior holes used by the mice or little humps of earth where the mice have unloaded the dirt in their excavation work. Merely use a stick or a foot to gouge out the dirt over the runway and place the station over this disturbed portion of the runway system. Here, as in the first method, it is best to place a piece of sod or a rock on the station. When this method of placing the stations is used, the mice, if present, will show activity under the square in a very short time, usually in an hour or two and in never more than two days. With the well-defined runways showing under the station it is relatively simple to place the bait in the runway and cover it again with the square.

As to the labor involved, several orchardists in this section have timed their men in the orchard practice so that it is now possible to give the following figures on labor cost. It was found that in using the old method of placing bait in open holes and runways it took 5 man-days per 25 acres. For placing stations over gouged-out runways, it took

1 2/3 man-days per 25 acres, and for placing bait under the concentration stations it took 1 man-day per 25 acres. In other words, the initial labor of placing stations and bait is 2 2/3 man-days per 25 acres, and after this is done it takes only 1 man-day per 25 acres for the next 3 or 4 years. Compared with the old method of placing bait in open holes and runways, then covering it, the new method offers a very definite amount of labor saved, coupled with a big improvement in control results.

As for the time to put these concentration stations out, it can be said that this work is an excellent rainy day occupation during the summer months and early fall.

The rodenticide may be obtained through your county agent. To mix this toxic agent with apple, it is first necessary to cut the apple into approximately ½-inch cubes, then mix one level teaspoon of rodenticide to one quart of cubed apple baits; mix well by shaking contents in an enclosed can or by stirring. When mixed correctly, each cube of apple should be covered with the light gray powder of rodenticide. The orchardist should only mix the amount he can use at the time, for it is necessary to place relatively fresh baits in the runways or tunnels. When placing the baits, do not pick up the cubes with the fingers; instead use a sharp stick or piece of wire, stab each cube and place it in that manner. Two or three cubes to a tree should give ample control this year. Remember, that in the case of pine mice, their migratory habits make it necessary to poison every two months during the winter in some cases where there is an extremely heavy infestation.

FRUIT PRICES AND FRUIT PROFITS

Henry W. Miller, Jr., Fruit Grower, Paw Paw, W. Va.

This is a good time to take stock. We have produced, harvested, and marketed a crop of apples under wartime conditions. The season was one of many, unusual uncertainties and difficulties. It is now history. We should calmly discuss the results and lessons of the past hectic season in order to comprehensively prepare for the next crop.

I actively entered this apple business in a period of profound depression, 1931. There was something to do because our little company was $118,000 in debt. We had about lost our export business, the selling resistance was fierce, and the banks didn't seem very anxious to loan us another $50,000 to revamp our equipment and orchards.

I mention these personal facts so that you will understand my total lack of dismay at the many, new difficulties facing us today. I am approaching the next apple crop with confidence and hope, as usual.

Last year the industry, submitted to a very dangerous, major operation. This operation consisted in the removal of part of our internal

business freedom as a war measure. The Washington doctors, who performed this major operation, were generally men of good intent, but they were terribly short on practical experience and fundamental knowledge of the patient. In spite of this, the patient lived, and is enjoying fairly good health today, largely because of its natural, rugged constitution and its historic ability to absorb punishment.

The Government regulations of 1943 are behind us and Washington has started to figure on new regulations for the 1944 crop. It is encouraging to note that both the OPA and WFA are seriously beginning to look to the apple industry for practical knowledge and help and that they are starting to plan early.

No one is in position to forecast the definite nature of Government controls for the coming crop, but it is reasonable to expect that ceilings will be applied to apples again. If the crop is large and the package situation tight, there may be no need of set-aside orders to secure apples for processing. If the crop is very heavy, there is a possibility that Government support buying may come back. The Government still is in position to purchase apples for school lunches and also for Lease-Lend, when necessary and advisable.

I do not fear ceilings and other federal wartime controls in 1944 because we are learning to deal with our Government in a mutually cooperative manner. Many of the uncertainties of 1943 have been ironed out and consequently we can all see much farther than this time last year. The apple industry and Government should get along together much better in the future. We have all learned a lot and this includes officials of WFA and the OPA.

There are other reasons for stating that 1944 should be a good apple year and that operating conditions should be not much more difficult than the past season.

All apple product inventories will be practically exhausted before the new crop and the demand for all apple commodities will be almost unlimited this year. In addition to our present Army and civilian requirements, we should have a new demand from countries liberated by the Allies this year.

There is also a very real possibility of exporting a considerable tonnage of fresh apples to England and we may even regain some of our lost export business with Palestine and certain Latin American countries as our ship building industry catches up with the requirements of total war. Certain signs indicate that this condition is not far off.

The labor supply situation should be no worse and possibly easier. Surpluses of certain manufactured war materials are already with us and before 1944 is a closed book, some large wartime industries will be

slacking off, resulting in the releasing of manpower, which should in turn, ease our labor supply.

Packages will probably continue extremely short and every grower should endeavor to stock up as soon as possible with his minimum requirements, at least. I cannot urge this too strongly.

Production and packing costs will be slightly higher than last season. Most growers started the 1943 season with packages and other materials purchased at the comparatively low 1942 prices. This was a big advantage not available to us in 1944. Some materials are also selling under recently expanded ceilings. Labor bills will be higher because agricultural labor rates are not controlled until the individual is getting $2,400. a year, or more. My guess is that our *total production costs will be* 10 *or* 15 *percent above last season at least.*

This fact makes it tremendously important to secure a satisfactory ceiling from OPA. The only way this can be done is by a united front. We must be in position to furnish indisputable facts and figures. Guesses, vague threats, cuss words and political pressure will not and should not control the actions of OPA. We should and must have what the conditions justify and no more. This is no time to try to run a bluff on our own Government.

I respectfully suggest that the apple growers of Maryland give full support to Appalachian Apple Service and the National Apple Institute. *Washington officials will listen to these organizations because they know they represent you, the grower.* These organizations got you 40 to 50 cents more for every bushel of apples sold under the ceiling by convincing Washington that a higher ceiling was right and necessary. They are prepared to bat for you again. Are you supporting them with your cash and good will? If not, I most earnestly suggest that you do not continue to overlook this fine investment in your own business.

The grower who is afraid that we will raise too many apples this year is like the man who couldn't see the forest for the trees. The world needs a big crop of apples. A large crop can be absorbed under present conditions at fair prices and it is our solemn wartime duty to do everything possible to increase production.

OUR EXPERIENCE WITH THE 1943 FARM LABOR PROGRAM IN MARYLAND, AND PLANS FOR THE COMING YEAR

PAUL E. NYSTROM, Supervisor, Emergency Farm Labor,
Extension Service, College Park, Md.

The 1943 farm labor situation in Maryland was filled with many serious problems, most of which were solved in a rather satisfactory way, but the 1944 season looms as a more serious threat in view of the larger crop outlook.

During 1943, there were 6,000 farm laborers available in Maryland, including Bahamans, boys, girls, women, State prisoners, British sailors, American soldiers, and Coast Guardsmen, in addition to the usual type of labor although the latter was very small in number. There was a total of 125,000 placements, with eight labor camps and eight placement labor centers. Transient labor was housed in camps, tents, schoolhouses, etc. The peach and apple picking labor in Washington County was a real problem. The county agent, grower committees, and extension field workers got together, exploring housing conditions for orchard labor. Some women workers were recruited in Washington, D. C., and were housed in Hancock tourist homes. War prisoners could not be obtained, as they were not permitted in the Coast Defense area. About half the number of imported Bahaman laborers were used in Maryland, doing well in the vegetable areas, and reasonably well in the fruit harvest. Hancock growers finally obtained an abandoned C.C.C. camp for Bahaman laborers, and Smithsburg growers moved some buildings from an abandoned C.C.C. camp in Virginia, and financed the venture of erecting these buildings on some land which they purchased. It was felt that the imported labor made the local labor more efficient.

The imported labor supply for 1944 is uncertain. There is little chance of getting colored or white laborers from the South. However, with more responsible persons recruiting such labor, the situation may improve. Maryland is sending colored labor to Florida for the winter, and it is hoped that Florida will reciprocate. Probably Mexican and Bahaman labor will be available.

The plans for 1944 include establishment of some type of mobile camps, probably trailers, and Baltimore school children may fill these camps. The tide of war may help ease the labor situation, but this is uncertain and may be wishful thinking. Possibly war prisoners may be available. At any rate, all sources of possible farm labor supply are being investigated, and plans are going ahead. We must not be pessimistic, but should all work together to see that crops are grown and then be doubly cooperative in seeing that labor is found that will harvest these crops.

THE OUTLOOK FOR SPRAY MATERIAL SUPPLIES FOR 1944.

Observations On Codling Moth Control.

C. GRAHAM, Extension Entomologist, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

The outlook for insecticides and fungicides for food production in 1944 is fair. Users of these materials can help to alleviate the transportation and labor problems of the manfacturer by placing orders well in advance of the time the materials are to be used.

The supplies of lead arsenate, copper sulfate, calcium arsenate, sulfur and oil emulsion will probably be adequate, if the manufacturer receives the orders well in advance of the time the materials are to be used.

Pyrethrum for agricultural use will be limited to stocks now in the hands of dealers and to low grade flowers and the residue left after extracting the active principal and the resins from the purification of the extract. All the rest will go to the armed forces for control of malaria.

The rotenone outlook is most unfavorable. It is possible that we will receive around 3,000,000 pounds which is about half the amount necessary for agricultural use. Cryolite is plentiful and should be used as a substitute for rotenone, and other scarce insecticides where cryolite is effective.

There are many other insecticides and fungicides that are required for agricultural use but are used in much smaller quantities than the materials listed above. The outlook for practically all these materials is fair.

Codling Moth

The short apple crop of 1943, plus a favorable year for codling moth, resulted in a high percentage of wormy and stung apples. It is doubtful, however, if the actual number of wormy and stung fruit was any greater than in 1942, when most orchards had a fair crop of fruit. In line with this thought, it is my opinion that the carry-over of worms in most Maryland orchards is no greater than in 1942. This, if true, does not offer any great satisfaction to the fruit grower for greatest effort will be required to hold the moths at an average level. This would be true in normal times, and with the present inexperienced labor and in some instances poor equipment, the effort on the part of the grower must be increased to prevent a tremendous build-up of worms during the next season. Many growers are using dynamite sprays to help overcome some other spray weakness. As fruit prices increased more high priced insecticides will be used and their use will continue so long as apple prices remain high. Nicotine, oil, and nicotine and oil combinations, when applied in the proper manner and at the proper time, are effective in helping to hold codling moth under control. Under existing conditions the high cost of using the dynamite methods would seem practical, but with the return of cheap apples the grower, through necessity, will have to substitute timeliness and thoroughness for the more expensive methods.

All orchardists who have a real worm problem are urged to practice sanitation methods to the extent that labor conditions will permit. Scraping and banding trees, screening packing houses and pruning so

as to permit the spray man to get under the tree when spraying, are always good, sound practices.

Codling Moth Experiments

During 1942, tests were conducted in a heavily infested orchard on the Eastern Shore, using the following materials. All plots received the regular schedule of lead and fungicide. In addition to the regular schedule some plots received nicotine sulfate, summer oil, and summer oil plus nicotine sulfate.

Addition of nicotine sulfate to the regular schedule resulted in 8.01 percent more clean fruit than where the regular schedule was used alone. Addition of nicotine sulfate plus summer oil resulted in 14.82 percent, and oil alone 8.18 percent more clean fruit than in the regular schedule.

Included in the above tests newly emerged codling moths were placed in screen wire cages and hung in the tops of trees to determine the effect of nicotine sulfate, nicotine sulfate plus oil, and DX on the adult moths. These tests were conducted when the temperature was around 85° F. The moth kills with the different materials are shown in the following table.

Materials Used	No. of moths placed in cage	No. Living	No. Dead	% Dead
Black-Leaf-40 plus regular schedule	22	5	17	77.30
Black-Leaf-40 plus oil plus regular schedule	37	4	33	89.19
D-X plus regular schedule	18	13	5	27.77

COMMITTEE REPORTS

The following list of officers was submitted by the *Nominating Committee* and adopted unanimously:

President—Dwight T. Walker, Mt. Airy

1st Vice-President—Lloyd Balderston, Colora

2nd Vice-President—Marshall T. Heaps, Cardiff

Executive Committee—R. S. Dillon, Jr., Hancock; A. Lee Schrader, College Park; Stanley M. Fulton, Hancock; William C. Main, Hagerstown; D. Eldred Rinehart, Smithsburg; E. C. McFadden,

Hagerstown; Sherman B. Waddell, New Windsor; Russell C. Shaw, Stewartstown (Pa.); J. Andrew Cohill, Hancock; G. Rust Canby, Silver Spring; John P. Caspar, Hancock.

Director to Farm Bureau—Marshall T. Heaps, Cardiff

Delegates to Farm Bureau—E. Dwight McCain, Frederick; D. Eldred Rinehart, Smithsburg.

Directors to Appalachian Apple Service—E. D. McCain; W. T. Delaplaine; G. W. Gardenhour, Lloyd Balderston; Stanley M. Fulton.

After a short discussion stressing the necessity of increasing the funds of the Society for probable increased expenditures for various matters that may develop, it was voted unanimously to increase the annual membership fee to $2.00, beginning 1945.

The *Auditing Committee* reported the Treasurer's books to be in good order.

The *Resolutions Committee* submitted the following resolutions which were adopted with little discussion:

RESOLUTIONS

WHEREAS, it has pleased Almighty God, in His wise providence to take from our midst during the past year, our esteemed fellow members:

Edmund P. Cohill
Charles L. Smith
Benjamin B. Jones

who, over a long period of years were actively interested in the welfare of this Society, and in their passing, the Society as well as the fruit-growing and farming interests of Maryland have suffered a serious loss:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:
that we hereby acknowledge our indebtedness to the services of our deceased fellow members, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:
that a copy of this resolution be entered upon the minutes of this meeting of the Society, and a copy be sent to the families of the deceased.

WHEREAS, it has pleased Almighty God, in His wise providence to take from our midst, during the past year, our esteemed fellow member

Harry W. Skinner

who, over a long period of years was actively interested in the welfare of this Society, and in his passing, the Society as well as the fruit-growing interests of Maryland as well as his native State of Pennsylvania have suffered serious loss,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,
that we hereby acknowledge our indebtedness to the services of our deceased fellow member, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
that a copy of this resolution be entered upon the minutes of this meeting of the Society, and a copy be sent to the widow of the deceased.

WHEREAS, at this time, pressure is being exerted by certain groups in this country, to have the Federal Government establish subsidies upon some agricultural product and commodities, and

WHEREAS, we believe that such subsidies will increase the national debt, tending toward inflation and will simply postpone to a future time the payment of an expense that should be borne by this generation,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,
that the Maryland State Horticultural Society assembled at its Forty-Sixth Annual Meeting, expresses its opposition to the establishment of any subsidies on agricultural products, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
that a copy of this resolution be sent to Maryland Senators and Representatives in the Congress.

WHEREAS, the farm labor problem offered serious consequences to the food producers of Maryland, during the past year, and

WHEREAS, the problem was skillfully handled by those appointed to the administration of the many details connected with it,

BE IT RESOLVED,
that The Maryland State Horticultural Society assembled in its Forty-Sixth Annual Meeting, express its appreciation to the Director and Members of the staff of The Extension Service, University of Maryland, and thanks for their exceptionally fine work during the past year, in assisting in furnishing farm labor during the harvest season.

WHEREAS, more than half of the fresh fruits and vegetables delivered by truck to Marsh Market and Camden Market, Baltimore City, comes from farms in Maryland, and

WHEREAS, those wholesale markets are inadequate to meet the changes which have taken place in transporting and marketing fresh fruits and vegetables, and

WHEREAS, the congested condition in these two markets results in delay for shippers, truck haulers and buyers, adds to the cost of distribution, and increases deterioration and loss in handling,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED,
that the Maryland State Horticultural Society go on record as favoring the construction of a modern wholesale market for fresh fruits and vegetables in Baltimore City, and

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED,
that the Market Commission, recently appointed by the Governor, be informed of this action, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
that we urge the Market Commission to make appropriate reports and recommendations regarding the early establishment of a suitable wholesale fruit and vegetable market in Baltimore City.

RESOLVED, that the Maryland State Horticultural Society urge the National Apple Institute, as the national representative of the apple industry, to endeavor to join with the national organizations of other fruits in order to establish a National Fruit Advisory Council that will be able to capably represent the entire fruit industries of the country in the post-war export trade.

WHEREAS, the Federal Income Tax laws, regulations and instructions, as they apply to farmers and fruit growers are unnecessarily complex, and

WHEREAS, The Federal Income Tax results in heavier taxation of income which varies greatly from year to year, such as is experienced by fruit growers, than of income which is regular,

BE IT RESOLVED,
that the Maryland State Horticultural Society request the appropriate authorities to make such changes in income tax laws and procedure as will make them less complex, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,

that such authorities be urged to devise legal means which will minimize the comparatively heavier income taxes upon farmers and fruit growers whose income varies greatly from year to year.

WHEREAS, we fully realize the importance of a solid home front in this time of world conflict, be it

RESOLVED, that as patriotic Americans, the fruit-growers stand ready to abide by any reasonable orders or decrees established by the War Production Board, War Food Administration, and Office of Price Administration, consistent with the preservation of the fruit crop between the points of production and consumption, and the orderly marketing of this fruit. Loss of fruit in transit or storage is not only a loss to the grower, but a waste of potential food so greatly needed in the war effort, both in the front lines and on the home front.

WHEREAS, the representative organizations of the fruit-growing industry have, during the past year rendered untold valuable services to the industry and the individual growers in problems of national importance, be it

RESOLVED, that the Maryland State Horticultural Society express, on behalf of the fruit-growers of the State of Maryland, a sincere appreciation of the continued good work of Appalachian Apple Service, National Peach Council, National Apple Institute, International Apple Association, Cooperative Fruit and Vegetable Association in protecting and furthering the production and marketing interests of the fruit growers, leading toward the orderly marketing of the crop. Our deep gratitude goes to the Secretaries of these organizations for their strenuous and untiring efforts in our behalf.

WHEREAS, our meetings have been both pleasant and instructive, be it

RESOLVED, that the Society extend sincere thanks to the speakers, officers, committees, all of whom have added to the value of our Forty-Sixth Annual Meeting. Our gratitude and appreciation is also extended to the management and staff of Hotel Alexander for their cooperation in furnishing our meeting hall, and catering to our convenience and comfort.

THE CODLING MOTH PROBLEM

W. S. HOUGH, Entomologist, Winchester Research Laboratory of the Virginia Experiment Station, Winchester, Va.

The history of codling-moth control in commercial apple growing districts of Virginia during the past 25 years includes the following pertinent items: The number of sprays has doubled, and in many orchards it has trebled; the volume of spray applied per tree of bearing age and similar size has more than doubled; spraying equipment has increased greatly in mechanical efficiency; the number of sprayers per unit acreage has increased; the minimum dosage of 2 pounds of lead arsenate in 100 gallons of water has increased to 3 pounds; effectiveness of lead arsenate has been improved by refinements in its manufacture; lead arsenate has been fortified by the use of oil as an ovicide and as a sticker; other materials have been added to the sprays to increase efficiency and orchard sanitation adopted to supplement chemical control; but the codling moth is still the most important apple insect, and the percentage of injury is at least as high as it was 20 to 25 years ago. This history is not peculiar to Virginia orchards.

No doubt, a number of factors have influenced the increased difficulties of codling moth control. For example, as the trees increase in age they grow taller and the tree tops become the most important area for invasion of the fruit by the codling moth larvae. The moths do not confine egg laying to the tree tops, but spraying is much less efficient in the upper part of the trees and consequently the larvae enter the fruit with less difficulty in the upper part of the trees than they do in the lower part of the trees. According to my observations the weakest point in codling moth control in most orchards is failure to spray efficiently the upper third of each tree. The older trees also provide more hibernating places for the wintering larvae and thus make certain the perpetuation of the insect.

Seasonal conditions greatly influence the fluctuations in severity of codling moth damage. The warm and relatively dry weather of the summer of 1943 was most favorable for egg production. Increased egg production means increased intensity of the worm attack on the fruit, and the grower may not increase the number of applications necessary to control the increased intensity of the attack on the fruit.

The apple crop in Virginia in 1943 ranged from less than 10% to about 30% of a normal crop. A light crop of fruit is usually accompanied by an increase of codling moth injury on the apples. The moths deposit most of their eggs on the leaves nearest to the fruit, or on the fruit. When the number of apples is relatively small, the eggs are not distributed on as many leaves. In other words, the concentration of eggs is increased in the vicinity of each apple. It is much more difficult to keep an apple free from codling moth injury when several young larvae can attack the same apple than if only one worm is available for the attack.

Another and perhaps more subtle factor is the shift or change in the nature or composition of the codling moth population in some commercial orchards. We now know that the codling moth is more difficult to control in some commerical orchards than in orchards that have never been sprayed. Evidence to this effect is summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Relative ability of codling-moth larvae to enter sprayed apples, showing average percentage of live entries found in the sprayed fruit.

Year	Material and amount per 100 gallons	Larvae from home orchards (unsprayed)	Larvae from commercial orchards (sprayed)
		%	%
1934	Lead arsenate 4 lbs.	1.9	9.9
1935	Lead arsenate 4 lbs.	2.9	12.3
1943	Lead arsenate 4 lbs.	1.5	26.6
1934	Cryolite 3 lbs.	5.8	11.7
1935	Cryolite 3 lbs.	4.2	11.9
1934	"Fixed" Nicotine 3 lbs.	7.4	15.4
1935	"Fixed" Nicotine 3 lbs.	5.9	14.0

The codling moth, no doubt, entered commerical orchards from the so-called home orchards or unsprayed orchards which were planted in the vicinity prior to the time of the commercial orchard development. Beginning with the calyx application in commerical orchards the spray program has always been largely governed by requirements for codling moth control. As requirements increased, the number of sprays increased as well as the volume of spray applied. The arsenical sprays eliminated large numbers of the young worms, but usually there were survivors and among the survivors were hardy or resistant individuals which were able to reproduce their kind. Thus, in the course of time, the insect in some commercial orchards increased in the proportion of hardy individuals and in this way the average ability of the population to enter the sprayed fruit has increased.

In the laboratory we have been able to breed several resistant or hardy strains of the codling moth by continuously rearing the larvae on apples freshly sprayed with lead arsenate. These hardy or more resistant strains are subject to the same fluctuation in the rise and fall of the intensity of attack on fruit in favorable and unfavorable weather conditions as are the weaker strains. The hardy or resistant strains can be controlled by lead arsenate sprays, but are not as easily controlled as the weaker strains. In other words, as the level of vigor or

resistance in the codling moth increased, the less effective the lead arsenate sprays appeared to become. Another item worthy of note is that the vigorous or hardy strains were more resistant to control by non-arsenical insecticides (Cryolite, phenothiazine, nicotine bentonite) as compared to their parent strains.

If spraying in commercial orchards may aid in selection of a more vigorous or resistant race of codling moth in some localities, the question arises, "What is the effect when a commercial orchard is abandoned?" The only data that we have on this subject relates to an abandoned commercial orchard situated in the midst of a commercial orchard area on Apple Pie Ridge. This orchard contains about 75 acres. The orchard was abandoned at the close of the 1937 season and except for an experimental block of about 10 acres in 1938 and again in 1939 the orchard has received no sprays since it was abandoned. Tests with larvae from this orchard during the past three seasons show that their ability to enter sprayed fruit has remained on the same level with the codling moth from other commercial orchards. In other words, there has been no indication as yet that the codling moth in this abandoned orchard may revert to the low level of resistance as demonstrated by the weaker strains inhabiting the unsprayed home orchards which are isolated from commercial orchards. In this connection I might say that the more vigorous or resistant strains developed in the laboratory have demonstrated their superiority over weaker strains in the number of eggs deposited per female moth; so, if the proportion of resistant individuals in a given population is high, the level of resistance may be maintained on unsprayed fruit in the abandoned orchard.

We do not wish to convey the idea that the codling moth is developing strains which cannot be controlled. This certainly has not occurred and probably never will occur. It is important, however, to recognize the fact that the insect in many orchards cannot be adequately controlled by the same spray program employed 25 years ago, even though the modern spray machine and the methods of application of the sprays are much more efficient than they were a quarter of a century ago. In some orchards, an efficient sticker added to the lead arsenate spray will produce the desired results. There are also many orchards in which adequate control requires the use of summer oil in egg-killing dosages in the critical lead arsenate sprays against the first brood. Lastly, there are instances where adequate control has not been obtained except by the use of a triple-acting spray employed at the proper time against the first brood. A triple-acting spray usually consists of lead arsenate to poison young larvae, summer oil to destroy eggs, and nicotine to destroy moths. Most effective results in applying the triple-acting spray are obtained when the tree is enveloped in spray, that is by spraying each tree row from both sides, rather than waiting until the wind direction changes before spraying the opposite side.

THE WORLD FRUIT SITUATION AND POST-WAR PROBLEMS

FRED A. MOTZ, International Commodity Specialist, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, U.S.D.A., Washington, D. C.

When your secretary invited me to attend this meeting, I was pleased to accept for two reasons, first to renew old acquaintances, and second, to present certain views and problems in connection with the international fruit picture and to point out the part which you, as fruit growers and shippers will be expected to play in the post-war reconstruction period.

Most Maryland growers need no introduction to the export market. Through long years of association with overseas markets they have learned to recognize the meaning and the value of trade.

The question in the minds of Maryland growers as well as exporters of apples and other fruits everywhere is AFTER THE WAR—WHAT THEN?

The struggle in which we are at present engaged has affected people in every walk of life; there has been no complete escape. Those within range of cannon shot or death-dealing block busters have been the principal sufferers, but even non-belligerents far removed from the theatres of operation are feeling the effects of an all-out, global, total war. Casualties have been tremendous, not only in terms of human lives, physical disabilities, property, objects of art and culture, but also in the dislocation of production, distribution and allocation of supplies.

I believe we are all in agreement that our immediate problem is that of winning the war. We will win the war, make no mistake about that, but the next most important problem and the one which will take precedence when the battle of arms is concluded is that of securing the peace. We have waged wars in the past and have been victorious. We have not always been so successful, however, following the armistice.

It is not my intention to debate the merits of free trade versus protective tariffs or isolation versus intervention. The point I would like to develop, however, is American participation in world affairs and the contribution which you as fruit growers are prepared to make in guaranteeing the peace.

Are we as a nation going to continue to be military friends and economic enemies with our allies, or are we going to work together in times of peace as we have done when threatened with disaster?

Years before we were forced into war we saw the world growing smaller. Sailing vessels were displaced by the steamship which brought far-away markets within our reach. Highly perishable products were transported successfully over long distances. This was considered a marvelous achievement, but progress does not stop there. When we blacked out our coast lines against possible air raids from Germany and

Japan it was an admission that distance had been annihilated. People once halfway across the world have suddenly become our next door neighbors.

When the war is over, the United States will be faced with a problem which will call for an important, carefully deliberated decision. Will there be a willingness on the part of the American people to accept the principle that they are a part of the whole international structure? Or, when the shouting and the celebration of the peace has subsided, will they pull back into their shell and begin piling more brick upon a containing wall?

Having lived abroad for many years I have not found it difficult to get along with other people. Conflict of opinion is natural and to be expected, but differences usually can be worked out if the parties concerned are willing to come together, exchange views and develop a formula under which both can operate to their mutual advantage.

No one country can long continue to prosper at the expense of another. We are waging this war in defense of that principle. Our history and our common sense tells us that if we as a nation are to prosper, we must be productive. By the same token, the other fellow must be productive also. But can any country in the world—the United States or any other—be fully productive if an impassable moat is dug around it? can any nation imprison productivity without stifling it? The moat must be filled or bridged over by tolerance, understanding, and willingness to participate in the exchange of goods and services. Let me underscore that world "exchange". A good balanced economy can result only from the ability to buy as well as to sell. Markets cannot be measured in terms of population, but rather in their ability to purchase, which means their ability to produce and exchange. There are millions of people in the world willing to make a considerable sacrifice for just one bite of a juicy apple or pear. On several occasions I have seen people in wretched circumstances stand and look longingly at a display of fruit, then bargain with the vendor over the price of a partly decayed apple or a few half rotten grapes. Desires can be created and appetites developed, but they cannot be satisfied commercially without spending power, which is the result of producing and exchanging with one another.

You know, of course, that foodstuffs are an important factor in our international trade, but have you realized that fruit tops the list of our food exports? Fruit ranks first in importance among foods exported from the United States, with an average annual value of $87,000,000 in the 10 years prior to this war. Among all our agricultural exports, fruit is outranked in value only by cotton and tobacco.

Every grower in this country, whether he has personally exported his fruit or not, has had a definite stake in the export market. Every

bushel of apples which has left these shores in past years has made your home market just that much more attractive. For more than a century we have been exporting apples to Europe in ever increasing quantities. In fact, the export market has frequently been referred to as the safety valve of our apple industry. Exports in some years ran as high as 16 percent of our commercial crop, as against an average movement of around 10 to 12 percent. Translated into terms of bushels this has meant the removal of some 12 to 20 million bushels of apples which otherwise would have been placed upon our domestic market. During the twenties and the thirties, when supplies were often far in excess of requirements and the market was depressed, did it ever occur to you how much worse the position might have been had this additional 10 to 20 million bushels not been sailing the seven seas?

In short crop years or under conditions such as those existing today, the value of an export market loses some of its importance. Momentarily, however, we are having quite a new experience, a situation where requirements are far in excess of supply, coupled with unprecedented spending power. None of us is naive enough, however, to believe that this condition will continue; therefore, we are asking ourselves the question of what will our relationship be with respect to the rest of the world when hostilities cease and world commerce is resumed.

For many years growers regarded the overseas market as a dumping ground, not only for their surpluses, but for off-grade fruit as well. I cannot say truthfully that the latter policy was always an unwarranted practice because in many instances immediate returns were highly satisfactory. Following World War I, however, a great change took place in the international fruit picture and many long-established practices became obsolete. Important shifts occurred in the location of the industry itself. Countries which were unknown from a horticultural point of view, suddenly sprang into international prominence. We witnessed a substantial increase in both production and consumption. Many new varieties were introduced which revolutionized consumer habits and broke down long-established trade customs. Great strides were made in production methods and in the physical handling of the crop itself. Higher packing standards were almost universally adopted. Pre-cooling, improved methods of refrigeration, pre-ripening and conditioning are all products of the past two decades.

In addition, the world transportation system has been practically revolutionized. Many new lines were organized with fleets of ships designed especially for carrying fruit. Other lines had their ships re-engined and reconditioned to establish more frequent, faster and regular sailing schedules. This permitted the successful transport of highly perishable products over great distances, thus providing world markets with an abundance and variety of supply, which a few years ago was considered impossible. There is perhaps no period in the

history of commercial fruit growing when so many changes have occurred on such a large scale and over so wide an area as those which took place during the period between the two world wars.

Time does not permit me to elaborate on any of the above points, but it would not be difficult to spend an hour or more in discussing the development of the South African deciduous industry or the Palestine citrus industry, or the Argentine or Brazilian industries and the stakes for which they are playing in winning their proportionate share of the world's markets. The record shows that prior to 1930 Belgium was the principal pear exporting country of the world, but was replaced by the United States in the volume of pears moving in international trade. Grape exports from the United States increased from 172,000 pounds in 1921-22 to 80 million pounds in 1938-39. Exports of oranges and grapefruit from Palestine increased from 2 million boxes in 1928-29 to over 15 million boxes in 1938-39. During the past 10 years Argentina as a fruit producing nation has risen from a place of obscurity to one of international importance. Freight loading of apples from the Rio Negro Valley alone increased from 135,000 boxes in 1932 to three and a half million and pears from the same area rose from 202,000 boxes in 1932 to around 4 million in 1943. And, so on, ad infinitum.

While production had shown a phenomenal increase in all parts of the world before the war, the orchards and vineyards in the combat zones indicate a serious decline in production. In the European theatre fruit growing has been one of the greatest of agricultural casualties, largely because of neglect, lack of essential production materials, disruption of transportation and distribution facilities and adverse weather conditions.

In Europe the winters of 1939-40 and 1941-42 are said to have been the most severe on record, resulting in a very severe loss of fruit trees. In Germany alone, it is reliably estimated that the mortality will exceed 60 million trees or more than one-third of the total pre-war tree population. In Finland, it is reported that the industry has been almost entirely wiped out, and we learn that serious damage occurred all the way from the Scandinavian countries south to the Mediterranean and Black Seas. We are told also that the production of oranges in Spain has declined from a pre-war average of 36 million boxes to 15 million, while in Palestine production has dropped from 15 million to 5 million boxes.

Based upon such information as is available, it is reasonable to conclude that the world fruit picture has undergone another radical change. The problem in which you and I are now interested is the part which this country is going to play in meeting these changed conditions.

During the twenties and thirties, vigorous campaigns were conducted in Europe to make the people more fruit conscious so that they might conserve the ever-increasing supplies imported from all corners of the

earth. The campaigns were a success, appetites were created and the markets became clearing houses for the world's offerings.

The one thing we are certain of is that the European appetite for fresh fruit having been frustrated for so long has been sharpened to a keen edge. From England especially we hear about the monotony of the diet and what they would give for just one orange, or grapefruit, or apple. We know also that after the war is over Europe will need to import large quantities of agricultural products; what we do not know, however, is the priority rating which will be accorded to fruits. It is not alone a question of consumer needs and of availability of shipping space. The over-all problem will revolve around the amount of funds or goods for international trading purposes which each country will be able to salvage or produce in the wake of the economic chaos of war.

We do not have to be financial experts to recognize the magnitude of the problem. We can see why it is altogether likely that the different types of restrictive controls, which operated before the war and which have become even stronger during the struggle, will continue in some form or other to operate for some time after hostilities cease. This country is playing an important military part in the European theatre and I sincerely hope that we will maintain an equally important stature when the post-war plans are being developed and formulized. We have accepted the curtailment of fresh fruit shipments abroad in the proper spirit, knowing full well that the utilization of all available shipping space with strategic military material took precedence over desirable but not necessarily essential goods in the military sense.

Our fruit industry, however, while quite willing to sacrifice its overseas outlets as a wartime measure is not conceding the permanent loss of the export market, nor does it expect to give up its proper share in it.

Since the United Kingdom was our most important customer before the war, it is only natural that we should consider her in terms of our best overseas outlet after the war. Under the terms of the Ottawa agreement of 1932, our apples had to pay a duty of four shillings and sixpence per cwt., as against free entry for apples produced within the British Empire. In the trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom signed on November 17, 1938, apples were reduced under the terms of the agreement to 3 shillings from the 16th of August to the 15th of April, inclusive. The agreement became effective January 1, 1939, for an initial period of 3 years, and was to continue in force indefinitely thereafter, subject to termination by either government on 6 months' notice.

During the course of negotiations a number of notes were exchanged between the respective governments, one of which had to do with the movement of fruit and which read as follows:

"The Secretary of State (Hull) to the British Ambassador (Lindsay)

Department of State,
Washington, November 17, 1938

EXCELLENCY:

"During the course of the negotiation of the Trade Agreement signed this day, it has been explained that the fruit growers of certain parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations, together with the United Kingdom producers, have for some time past cooperated in an organization called the Empire Fruits Council, which has made arrangements concerning the shipment of apples to the United Kingdom market from overseas, with the object of maintaining a stable and remunerative market in the interest of all concerned and of avoiding, so far as possible, temporary periods either of oversupply or of shortage. It is understood that British Empire producers of citrus fruits are also represented on this Council.

"It has been represented to me that the cooperation of the exporting interests in the United States, which is the only major apple-exporting country, would be of great assistance in securing the orderly marketing of the apple crop and would be of no less benefit to them than to the other suppliers. I have the honor to inform you that the Government of the United States of America inclines to the view that it is in the general interest that the shipment of apples to the United Kingdom should be so planned as to avoid excessive variations in supplies and prices, and that it will call the attention of United States exporting interests to the desirability of their cooperating with the Empire Fruits Council in such arrangements as may be feasible to assure the orderly supply of apples to the United Kingdom market.

"In the foregoing connection, your attention is invited to legislation in effect (Public No. 39, 73d Congress, approved June 10, 1933) which provides for the regulation of exports of apples (and pears) from the United States on the basis of grade or quality. Under this Act, the Department of Agriculture has issued regulations which require that all apples (and pears) shipped to foreign countries meet certain export standards. The effect of these regulations is to make large shipments of low-quality fruit to British or other foreign markets impossible.

"I understand that up to the present no similar arrangements have been made for planning the shipment of citrus fruits to the United Kingdom market, but that certain British Empire producers have expressed a desire for some form of arrangement for the orderly marketing of citrus fruits in the United Kingdom, with a view to avoiding disturbances resulting from sudden fluctuations in supplies. I have the honor to inform you that, if the principal supplying countries (including foreign countries) should agree to cooperate in arrangements for the orderly supply of citrus fruits to the United Kingdom market, the Government of the United States of America would call the attention of United States exporters to the desirability of cooperating in any feasible arrangements to this end.

"I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurance of my highest consideration.

CORDELL HULL

His Excellency
The Honorable Sir Ronald Lindsay,
P. C., G. C. M. G., K. C. B., C. V. O.,
British Ambassador."

England declared war on Germany in September 1939 and imports of fresh fruit were among the very first of the commodities to be curtailed. The new agreement, therefore, never had an opportunity to function. Consequently, we are in no position to judge its merits. But we know that the environment in which its influence will again be brought to bear will be materially different from that in which it was originally drawn.

This then brings us up to the principal point of my discussion, that of the basis on which the United States of America shall participate in world fruit affairs. The question of United States participation in the Empire Fruits Council in London was raised before the war and we are told that serious consideration is now being given to the question of including certain other non-Empire countries in addition to the United States. Should the United States be asked to become a part of such an international council and should they accept, the problem immediately arises as to who should speak for the United States and on whose behalf. It is my personal opinion that in order to meet on equal terms with representatives of other countries, we should have in this country an accredited council which would be authorized to advise with our responsible government officials on behalf of the fruit interests of the country in respect to such international undertakings. In each of the countries now operating within the framework of the Empire Fruits Council there is a national organization, representative of the fruit industry as a whole and in whose behalf the spokesman at the Empire Council expresses himself. We are the only major fruit producing country normally dependent upon exports, which is not equipped with some kind of industry body representing all horticultural interests which is capable of dealing with international problems, in collaboration with the government.

I do not believe it will be a matter of choice whether quantitative as well as qualitative controls over imports and exports are to be exercised in the post-war world. But it is a matter of choice how the United States Government and the United States producing and distributive interests prepare themselves to meet the situation.

We have an excellent basis for such an advisory body in the already established and active horticultural societies, trade and marketing organizations, and commodity associations. As individuals we cannot address ourselves to foreign governments. Neither can government representatives act for you successfully without the benefit of your

working knowledge, your concept of hopes and desires, and your support. The United States spokesman who participates in any international fruit council must be your representative, the representative of a common, agreed-upon point of view. He must represent, and not improvise; but he can do so only if the industry decides and defines what it wants, and what responsibilities it is willing and able to undertake.

The difference between success and disappointment in the conduct of our affairs abroad will lie to a large extent in the way in which we attend to, or neglect, the expression of our common hopes and beliefs here at home. The international conference table is no place to settle differences of opinion between ourselves. Lively differences and spirited competition are a part of the vitality and progressiveness of our industry. But all of this is good and productive of efficiency and progress because it stems from the deep reaches of our common standards and purposes.

We now have the task of searching out the choices which will be open to us in our post-war international opportunities and obligations. We shall have to find the way to give definition and practical expression to our conclusions. A thicket of seedling ideas sprouting up and growing wild will not be very productive. We shall have to devise a process for sorting them out, arranging them in orderly fashion, cultivating, fertilizing, and —yes—pruning them until we have something worth showing the neighbors.

We shall need a clear and recognized channel through which every producer may have a way to make his voice heard; to have his views and proposals weighed, considered, and merged with other producer views, first by his own section or commodity group and then by the industry as a whole, to emerge eventually as a responsible statement or recommendation on behalf of the whole industry. The problem I am calling to your attention is how to establish that channel of democratic, responsible procedure.

I am not presuming to suggest when the war will end but I am suggesting that we begin taking immediate steps toward the setting up of a national fruit body constituted along the lines indicated. The State of Maryland being an important part of our national fruit industry must have appropriate representation and responsibility along with the other producing areas. When the Empire Fruits Council or any other international fruit body sits down to prepare plans for the immediate reconstruction period or the long-term period of development the United States must be prepared to play its part. It is, therefore, highly essential that the spokesman for the United States, whoever he may be, will be in position to deflect the point of view of his government, which is after all, the views of the people. Industry and government must work closely together and with complete understanding and harmony if international agreements are to succeed. It is my hope,

therefore, the fruit people of this country will take the lead in demonstrating just what can be accomplished in the way of world cooperation and assuring a just and lasting peace.

SOME POST-WAR PROBLEMS IN FRUIT GROWING IN THIS EASTERN REGION

This topic was carried as a discussion, covering post-war conditions and plans, regarding fruit varieties, by-product outlets, and general growers' problems or plans.

APPLE VARIETY ADJUSTMENTS

I. C. HAUT, University of Maryland, College Park Md.

Maryland and her neighboring states are in strong comparative position for the post-war period with the apple varieties which now compose the bulk of their plantings. Classing our apple varieties as Early, Early Winter, Intermediate and Late, let us trace the country-wide variety changes over the past 25 years, noting which varieties have increased or declined in that time.

Early

Transparent (decrease)
Duchess (decrease)
Northwestern (decrease)
Wealthy (decrease)
Others (decrease)

Early Winter

Grimes
Jonathan (increase)
Delicious (increase)
McIntosh (increase)
Golden Delicious (increase)
Cortland (increase)

Intermediate

Rome
Stayman

Late

Ben Davis (decrease)
Baldwin (decrease
Winesap (decrease)
Newtown (decrease)
York
Black Twig (decrease)
Others (decrease)

There has been a past or present decline or some varieties, including Duchess, Northwestern, Transparent, etc., among the early varieties, as well as the late varieties. These varieties, especially the late ones, formerly made up a heavy portion of our total apple tonnage. Since our total tonnage has not declined very appreciably, it is easy to see that the loss of late varieties has been greatly replaced by the tremendous increase in Delicious, McIntosh, Jonathan, and to lesser extent by Golden Delicious, Cortland, etc.,—varieties which fall into the Early Winter class. So, in the last 10 years alone, we have had an increase of at least 18 million bushels in the amount of fruit which has to be disposed of in about 3 or 4 months following harvest. So, despite some decline in total production, our marketing and storage problems have increased and with a return of normal conditions these problems

will become more and more troublesome with the increase in production of such Early Winter varieties as Delicious, McIntosh, Jonathan, etc., and the continued further decline of Late varieties such as Baldwin, Newtown, and soon, Winesap.

The shift also involves apples having certain uses. The newer varieties are of good dessert quality, but they are "one use" varieties, since they do not cook as well as those varieties which they have replaced. Never before has America been faced with such a high percentage of one-outlet, restricted-season, soft-fleshed varieties. Cold storage improvements can only partly alleviate this condition. Further reduction of total production will not help much as the reduction will come from the further decline in production of Early and Late Varieties.

Maryland fits well into the variety picture with a high percentage of Stayman, York, and Rome. These varieties are dual purpose apples, being good keepers, and adapted to dessert, culinary or dehydration uses, each variety having its particular adaptation to such varied uses. They also produce heavy crops, which is not the least to be considered in the years ahead.

A discussion of post-war problems and plans by growers brought out the suggestions that real effort should be made to build up our soils during these years of good sales; also, we should purchase carefully, and only what is needed; build up capital and reserves; purchase Government bonds; encourage loyalty among orchard employees, by providing good housing conditions; paying employees a bonus based on service or orchard profits; support our apple advertising programs, our horticultural societies, and our national apple and peach organizations. Finally, it was stressed that the fruit grades must be observed, and production must be brought up to a maximum efficiency.

ADJOURNMENT

REPORT

OF THE

THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

Maryland Crop Improvement Association

Baltimore, January 12, 1944

The subjects discussed in the Annual Meeting are presented here in a summarized form in order to conserve paper.

QUALITY OF HAY AND ITS EFFECT ON FEEDING VALUE

By Dr. K. L. Turk, Department of Dairy Husbandry,

University of Maryland

Hay is the most important single feed in the dairy ration; yet, it varies more in feeding value and in palatability than any other feed commonly used. There is a great difference in the quality of the same variety of hay as grown and harvested by different men in the same season and by the same men in different seasons.

The important quality factors in hay are:

Green color; high percentage of leaves; fine stemmed; soft and pliable; free from weeds, trash, and molds; sweet smelling.

It is important for the farmer to know how to judge the quality of hay by these physical characteristics, but it is more important to know how to grow and to harvest hay with methods that produce, year after year, the best quality possible. Hay of high quality is essential if a cow's capacity for roughage is to be fully used. The cow will consume more hay if it is good quality and each pound consumed will furnish more digestible nutrients than will poor quality hay. Since nutrients in hays and other forages are generally much lower in cost than nutrients from grain, maximum roughage consumption is essential for profitable milk production.

Milk cows get from 70 to 75 percent of their feed from forage and pasture crops, other cattle 80 percent, horses and mules 67 percent, and sheep about 96 percent. Almost one-half of the total forage intake is from hay.

Roughages probably have the greatest influence of any class of feeds upon production, reproduction, and growth of all classes of livestock, except swine and poultry.

The variety of hay is less a factor in determining its quality than is the time of cutting and methods used in harvesting. Different kinds of hay crops will furnish about the same percentage of total digestible nutrients if they are the same quality. Hays of different varieties will, however, differ materially in their protein, mineral and vitamin contents.

QUALITY HAY IN THE RATION OF DAIRY CATTLE

By Dr. L. A. Moore, Department of Dairy Husbandry
University of Maryland

During the past ten years the importance of making good quality hay has been considerably emphasized. There is good reason for this emphasis, since a large percentage of the total nutrients consumed by cattle should come from this type of feed.

Methods for proper growing and harvesting of the cereal grains for high quality have long since been perfected because the cereal grains are used for human food and have, therefore, been given considerable study in the past. Roughages, on the other hand, are not widely consumed by man and, therefore, have not received so much attention.

I should like to emphasize certain points which I feel to be important in producing the feeding good quality hay. I will divide my discussion into two parts.

First, we will discuss some of the known facts concerning the desirability of feeding and producing good quality hay.

Second, we will discuss briefly the possibility of the existence of unknown substances which are probably present in good quality hay and important to milk production.

Let us first take up some of the known facts about the importance of good quality hay.

1. Protein is one of the essentials for production of milk, meat or mutton. Roughages or hays of good quality are higher in protein than those of poor quality. Alfalfa hay of good quality contains as much as 16-18% protein, while alfalfa hay of poor quality might contain only 10-11%. The grain mixture for a hay with 16-18% protein would have to contain only 12-14% protein, whereas the grain mixture to be fed with a hay with only 10-11% protein would have to contain 18-20% protein. Therefore, it is quite apparent that the dairyman with good quality hay does not need to spend as much money for protein concentrates.

2. Nutrients other than protein, or the carbohydrate equivalent, of good quality hay are higher and more available than for a hay of poor quality. Surprisingly, 75% of the nutritive value of hay is contained in the carbohydrate fraction. The higher carbohydrate content in good quality hay means that a smaller proportion of the nutrients need to come from the concentrate portion of the ration.

3. In general, hay of good quality is more palatable so that livestock will consume more of it. This would, of course, cut down on the need for concentrates.

4. Good quality hay contains more of the mineral constituents than a hay of poor quality. Milking cows excrete large amounts of calcium and phosphorous in milk, which must be furnished by the feeds. With good quality of hay it is not necessary under most farm conditions to purchase extra minerals.

5. Good quality hay contains more of the vitamin factors than hay of poor quality. One of the most important vitamin factors, in so far as cattle are concerned, is the carotene or Vitamin A content of the hay. This factor is absolutely essential for proper health and reproduction of cattle as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. EFFECT OF GOOD QUALITY HAY ON REPRODUCTION*

FIRST GESTATION

Cow No.	Days Carried Calf	Wt. of Calf at Delivery	Condition of Calf at Delivery	Condition of Cow
Ration: Corn, oats, cottonseed meal, silage and timothy hay				
M 218	264	75	Strong	O. K.
M 254	271	84	Strong	O. K.
M 258	268	73	Strong	O. K.
M 242	266	84	Strong	O. K.
M 281	261	67	Strong	O. K.
Ration: Basal ration with wheat straw in place of timothy hay				
C 35	258	68	Blind	Retained placenta
C 37	218	33	Dead	Retained placenta
C 38	---	78	Blind, paralyzed	Retained placenta
C 39	---	55	Very weak paralyzed	Retained placenta
C 46	270	70	Blind, weak	O. K.
C 50	263	81	Dead	Retained placenta

* Data taken from Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Work.

The timothy hay used in this experiment was of No. 1 quality. The feeding of timothy hay of poor quality corresponding to grade 3 has

been shown to produce results similar to feeding wheat straw. A two-year old hay of good quality would be low in its carotene content.

Let us consider briefly some of the more important factors necessary to making good quality hay. Stage of cutting is one of the more important factors. Hay should be cut as early as possible so as to get the greatest yield of digestible nutrients. The early blossom stage is usually considered about right, but there is some variation among different crops.

The earlier the hay is cut, the higher the carotene and protein content. At this stage also less lignification has taken place. Lignification is a process by which the plant becomes woody and the nutrients are locked up so they are not available to animals. In an experiment carried out by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, alfalfa hay cut at the initial bloom stage produced 6,330 lbs. of milk per acre while hay cut at the half bloom stage produced only 5,224 lbs., and that cut at the full bloom stage produced only 3,970 lbs. of milk per acre.

Proper fertilization also is important for growing a plant which will make hay of good quality.

Curing procedures are most important in producing hay of good quality. This factor has most to do with the percentage of leaves retained by the hay and on the amount of leaching to which the hay is subjected.

Some data collected on hay cured by the barn or air-drying process developed in Tennessee indicates hay was produced which is higher in protein, calcium and sugar.

Now to consider some of the unknown factors which may exist in hay.

1. Some results of analysis of hays show considerable variation in sugar content. The relation of sugar content of hay to the occurrence of acetonemia or ketosis in cattle should be investigated. Sugar is usually fed in some form to help cure this condition in cattle and its presence in the hays might help to prevent it.

2. All of you have noted the increase in milk production produced by turning cows to pasture in the spring. This would indicate that pasture contains something not contained in winter roughage. Experiments at the Michigan Station show definitely that hays of various qualities vary in their milk stimulating ability. So far, the chemist does not know what to analyze for in order to study these milk stimulating substances. Future research may bring to light more knowledge concerning this important problem.

While there is still much to be learned about this subject, many dairymen could improve the quality of hay they produce by an applica-

tion of the knowledge we now have. Good quality hay is the backbone of economic milk production during the winter feeding season.

MAKING QUALITY HAY EVERY YEAR

By JOHN W. MAGRUDER, Extension Agronomist, University of Maryland

There are many things farmers can do to aid in making better quality hay, even though they are at the mercy of the weather. Until economical methods of curing good hay in all kinds of weather are discovered the best and most practical methods now known should be used for making hay of the highest possible quality. Most of the discussion today will be devoted to the more recent developments in hay curing. My objective is to point out some of the proven practices, which any farmer can use, and to suggest a guide for appraising the merits of new haying machinery, equipment and methods.

Hay must be cut early in order to obtain high quality. The stage of maturity at which hay is harvested is of more importance than is the kind of hay. Since the number of days of good hay curing weather is limited, sufficient haying machinery should be provided for rapid handling of the crop. Less time is lost in the field when necessary repairs are made before harvest time and the machinery is in good working order. Rapid handling of hay after it is cured reduces exposure to both sunshine and rain.

Use of long range weather forecasts can be applied more extensively in deciding when to cut hay, especially when large acreages are involved. Reasonably accurate forecasts for a period of two or three days can be secured by contacting the Office of the Maryland State Weather Service or your nearest Weather Bureau. This service can often inform farmers one or two days in advance of a period of protracted and heavy rainfall. This is the weather that makes hay curing in the field almost prohibitive or causes great loss in quality.

I would like to suggest a guide for judging the merits of haying machinery, equipment and methods:

1. To what extent does this method assure curing high quality hay in both good and bad weather?
2. Is the cost of curing and storing hay reasonable?
3. Is the initial investment excessive?
4. Is it adaptable to both small and large farms?
5. Does it make possible greater use of the regular farm labor force?
6. Is it a supplement to or a substitute for present harvesting and storage facilities?
7. Can it be used in handling other crops?
8. Does it conserve storage space?
9. Is the hay palatable to animals when cured by this method?
10. Is there a fire hazard?

FORCED VENTILATION BARN DRYING OF HAY

By W. H. Dickerson, Jr., Assistant Agricultural Engineer,
Virginia Polytechnic Institute

The barn hay drier is a result of experimental work carried out originally in Tennessee and was developed to complete the drying of partially field-cured hay by forcing air through it in the mow. This system consists of wooden ducts built on the mow floor through which air is forced by a motor-driven fan. A large main duct tapering from the fan carries the air to small lateral open bottom ducts from which it is forced into and upward through the hay. The duct system is designated to give an equal distribution of air over the entire mow floor. The design of this system can be varied considerably as is illustrated in the following color slides. (At this point Mr. Dickerson showed a series of color slides of installations of this system in barns in Southwestern Virginia).

The climatic conditions which enable Virginia farmers to produce good forage crops also make it hard for them to cure these crops into high quality hay. Records taken at Wytheville, Virginia, show that some rain falls on nearly one-half of the days during the hay-making season. The average total rainfall for any one month during the hay curing season is not excessive, but numerous light showers at short intervals make the field curing of hay hazardous. In 1942, a survey of hay losses was made on 215 farms in Southwestern Virginia counties with farmers reporting 25 percent of their crops lost or damaged.

The procedure for handling hay to be dried by the hay drier takes advantage of the very rapid drying in the field during the first few hours after cutting. The hay is cut in the morning as soon as the dew is off and allowed to dry for about 2 hours in the swath. It is then raked into windrows where it remains for another 2 or 3 hours. This field drying for 4 or 5 hours on a clear day reduces the moisture content of the hay from about 75% to 45%. At this stage the hay is placed on the ducts and the drying continues until the moisture content is reduced to 20%. Hay of this moisture content is safe for storing. By placing the hay in the barn on the drier the same day it is cut, damage resulting from dew, rain and excessive sun bleaching is eliminated.

When handling the hay in a semi-green condition, no leaves are lost. In placing it on the drier care must be used to see that it is distributed evenly and packed uniformly. This is very important in getting the proper distribution of air through the hay.

Virginia farmers have discovered that by using a barn type hay drier they can cure their high quality legume hay regardless of weather conditions, assuring an excellent green, leafy hay of high protein content. With the addition of home-grown grain, an efficient low-cost feeding ration is secured, requiring little or no supplementary protein feed.

Samples of hay cured on the drier and in the field, on the same farm or nearby farms, were graded and classified by the U. S. Department of Agriculture. That cured on the drier was consistently one to two grades better than the field cured hay.

After observing the use of hay driers in Virginia, farmers and agricultural leaders have reached the following conclusions:

1. This method of curing hay eliminates the danger of loss due to unfavorable weather.

2. The labor in handling the hay is no more, in many cases less, than in field curing the hay.

3. Mow storage capacity is increased up to 50 percent.

4. Any farmer who grows high quality forage crops can cure them as high quality hay by this method, which provides a practical, efficient ingredient for compounding low cost, home-grown dairy rations.

5. The Dairy Extension Specialist of the Virginia Extension Service estimates that a farmer with a 30-cow herd, feeding high quality hay cured by this method may:

Save at least 25 percent of forage crops normally lost or damaged by field curing.

Increase annual milk production.

Save up to 7 tons of high protein concentrate feed.

6. In addition to the increased income from feeding high quality hay, indirect gains are made through higher levels of milk production over longer lactation periods; better physical condition of the cows, tending to lengthen their productive life; and improved color and vitamin potency of the milk.

7. By growing high quality forage crops, curing them by this method and by feeding them on the farm, the farmer is able to make maximum use of sound agricultural production principles, including soil conservation and improvement and better live-stock nutrition at lower cost.

8. This method is practical and efficient for curing all types of hay on any size or type of farm.

The initial cost of the hay drier varies with its size. Those now in use in Virginia cost from $75 for the smallest drier in a mow 18 feet by 36 feet, using a 1 hp. motor, to $450 for the largest drier in a mow 34 feet by 66 feet, using a 7½ hp. motor. An analysis of the cost of all these driers shows that it varies from 15 to 20 cents per square foot of mow floor area used. This includes lumber, blower, labor, electrical materials, pulleys, belts, and one-fourth the value of the motor. Since the motor can be used for other jobs on the farm, only one-fourth of its cost is charged to the hay drier. Standard hay handling equipment is all that is needed in addition to duct system, blower, and motor. The

side delivery rake and hay loader speed up the field work, but they are not necessary for successful operation. The grapple type fork works better than the harpoon type for unloading the hay at the barn.

The operating cost varies with the outside weather conditions (humidity) and the moisture content of the hay when placed on the drier. During 1942, 1,005 tons of hay were cured on driers in Virginia, using 32 to 96 kwh. per ton, or an average of 53 kwh. per ton. The cost of this amount of electricity was 75¢ to $1.50. Farmers agree that this is a small sum to pay for the labor and hay saved from total loss, plus the improved quality of all hay cured by this method.

At the conclusion of Mr. Dickerson's discussion Frank Parish, Taneytown, Carroll County, Maryland, the only farmer in the state who has one of these systems installed on his farm, showed the audience a sample of alfalfa hay that he had cured by the barn drier method. This sample was inspected by the audience and it was the conclusion of those present that this was excellent quality hay.

Mr. Parish then gave the following remarks concerning his experience with the barn hay drying system: "I put in a rather large blower, larger than was specified in my correspondence with Mr. Dickerson. Whether this was necessary remains to be seen. Our experience during the past year has been very favorable. I think I might best explain my experience by asking some questions which have occurred to me during the use of this system on my farm. Is it possible to readily determine the humidity content of the air so that the system would be more efficiently operated?" Mr. Dickerson answered this question by stating that in their experience in Virginia they had been going by the "rule of thumb" method. Virginia farmers are instructed to begin operating their fans around 8:00 to 8:30 a.m., if the sun is shining and, if it continues to shine, they are to operate it continuously until 5:00 p.m. They are instructed to run their fans for a short period once or twice during the night to prevent heating of the hay. If it rains during the day, they shut the fans off other than running them for a short period once or twice during the day to prevent heating. Mr. Dickerson said that he believed that they had been rather successful in using their judgment as to when the air was dry enough to remove moisture from the hay.

Mr. Parish then continued "I have built a heating element in my system in order to use artificial heat to hasten curing of the hay. However, I am wondering if there is not some merit in allowing the hay to generate its own heat by not operating the fans for sometime and then when heat is built up in the hay to turn on the fans. It would seem to me that more moisture might be removed in this manner than by constant use of the fans." Mr. Dickerson stated that Virginia farmers had tried this method and had found that when they first turned the fans on after allowing the hay to heat the air was heavy with moisture but that in about 30 minutes the moisture dropped off and after an hour it

leveled off completely. Mr. Dickerson felt that more moisture was removed by running the fan all day.

Mr. Parish continued by asking Dr. Moore the following question: "How was the carotene content on the hay which you obtained from my mow and which I had dried by the forced ventilation system?" Dr. Moore replied that the carotene content of that sample of hay ran well above field cured hay. Mr. Parish was asked if he could raise calves on his hay without any other source of vitamin D. Mr. Parish said that he had raised all of his calves on this hay but in addition had used a commercial food containing vitamin D. Dr. Moore stated that the vitamin D content depends on how long the hay is exposed to the sun. The longer the hay is exposed to the sun, the higher the vitamin D. content. Hay which is taken in immediately after cutting would have very low vitamin D content.

At this point the meeting was adjourned for lunch.

Following the noon hour several more questions were asked with regard to the barn drying system.

Question: Is there much more work to getting hay out of a barn after it has been cured by the barn drying method as compared with the usual handling of loose hay? *Answer by Mr. Kuhn*—There is more labor involved in getting forced ventilation cured hay out of the barn because the higher moisture content at the time it is placed in the mow makes it pack more tightly. Most of the farms that we visited in Virginia where they are using this system were using a hay knife to aid in getting the hay out.

Question: Of the approximately 40 farms in Virginia which have these hay drying systems installed how many are using an artificial heating system to hasten the drying? *Answer by Mr. Kuhn*—There is only one in use at the present time with another one being installed.

Question: How many leaves are you going to have on the hay which Mr. Parish brought in by the time you take it from the mow to the feed rack? *Answer by Mr. Kuhn*—At the present dryness of his hay many leaves will be shaken off in the feeding process. However, this can be eliminated by blowing air into the mow on a day when the humidity is high thus putting some moisture into the hay so that it will not be too dry.

Question by Mr. Balderston: Should you put salt on the hay in order to keep it from getting too dry? The group concluded that salt would probably have very little effect on the dryness of the hay.

Question by Willis Cissel: When you say 3 hours of good sunshine for field curing of the hay to be placed on the forced ventilation system, does this have reference to early June or early July? *Answer by Mr. Kuhn*—Early July.

Mr. Kuhn remarked that he would like to emphasize a point which was brought out by one of Mr. Dickerson's slides that when you reduce the moisture content of hay from 75% to 45%, *three-quarters* of the moisture that has to be removed from the hay is eliminated.

OTHER AIDS TO MAKING QUALITY HAY

Discussion Leader, R. W. CARPENTER, Agricultural Engineering Department, University of Maryland

Professor Carpenter began the discussion by saying there are two angles to the problem of machinery for use in hay making. We can classify methods and machinery as to whether they are primarily for saving time or for weather insurance. The barn drying system would certainly come almost entirely under the head of weather insurance, as is also true of the making of grass silage. Any method which shortens the period of time between cutting hay and putting it in the barn is important. This afternoon session is built around the experience of men who have used various methods to get better quality hay and to save labor.

Professor Carpenter introduced William R. Powel, Manager of the Doughoregan Manor, Ellicott City, who gave the following remarks concerning his experience with a pickup baler: "This is a rough outline of our experience with a pickup baler. I see a number of people in the room who have a pickup baler or use pickup balers and I am sure I cannot give them much information. I am able to give a little information to those who haven't had the experience. Conditions are never the same on any two farms. Therefore, our problems wouldn't be exactly the same as yours. The first problem we had was the distance we had to haul the hay into the barn. Some of the fields are as much as two miles from the barn and hauling loose hay took a lot of time. We were naturally attracted to some method of baling the hay and getting more in the load. In 1936, we baled hay in the fields with a stationary baler to save time on the load. I felt we made a saving there. The following year we rented a pickup baler. The only limit to the baler capacity was the amount of hay on the back end of the baler that the men could tie the wires around. We always had to slow down to accomodate the crew of four or five men. Then, we heard about a baler that tied automatically and didn't have any blocks so we finally purchased one in 1938. The one we have now is very satisfactory.

"Another thing about using a machine like a baler under our conditions was that it geared the whole operation to a machine so that a crew of men, after the machine was operating at capacity, had only to get the hay into and way from it. We feel that we can pick up twice as much hay with the same number of men as we could by putting it up loose. In other words, with a pickup baler and the same number of men

it would take to run one outfit with a hay loader and put it into the barn loose, we do as much as with two such outfits. We feel that there is a big saving of time. Also, there is a saving in quality. The baler we have now picks up the hay gently and presses it into the bale so that there is less loss of leaves. If the hay is in condition where the leaves are inclined to fall from the hay, we usually pull the bale apart over the stall so that the leaves fall out where the cattle can get them. Although we have never kept sufficient records to say that we have run a scientific experiment of any sort, we do feel that if you have the time to spend operating the baler carefully, you can put up hay with a little bit more moisture in it and thus save in quality. One time we baled hay that was quite green. We packed it on the floor in the barn in a honeycomb fashion so that it got some ventilation. It dried out to a very good quality hay. However, we did not have the labor this year to pack it that way; therefore, we are not getting the quality hay we could."

Question: Do you think you can bale your hay greener and then put it in the mow, provided you leave air space around the bales? *Answer by Mr. Powel*—Our experiment turned out all right. It is my belief that if you are very careful in stacking the bales or if you built up some kind of false split floor you can get away with greener hay in the bales. But we must remember that whenever you try to make a saving like this by putting it in the barn greener you are hauling extra water from the field. We are very well satisfied with our pickup baler for the reason that it is saving us time on the long haul and also has saved us some leaves.

Question: Do you haul hay as soon as it is baled or do you let it stay in the field? *Answer by Mr. Powel*—We try to keep after the baler as closely as possible. We have frequent showers and the ground gets moist and the baler is apt to pick up some moisture from the ground; also, a little shower is apt to come along and wet the hay.

The question came up concerning balers which baled and tied hay for commercial shipping purposes. Roland M. Mullinix, Woodbine, Maryland, stated that his particular baler is a wire baler of that type and slices each fold of the bale. He said that they bought it for commercial use and there is no comparison between loose hay and baled hay as far as they are concerned.

Frank Bushey, Sykesville, Maryland, was called upon to discuss buck rakes. His discussion was as follows: "We had an old hay loader and decided to replace it. The Country Gentleman had a small article in 1941 discussing the use of buck rakes in Ohio. I sent to Ohio State University for plans for building a buck rake. We built it the best we could. Then, we were able to get a used dump truck with a hydraulic hoist so we attached our buck rake to this." (At this point color slides taken on Mr. Bushey's farm were shown)

Question: Can you get up more hay working by yourself with the buck rake than with a crew? *Answer by Mr. Bushey*— Yes, much more.

Question: How many people work on it? *Answer by Mr. Bushey*— Only one.

Question: How long a haul do you consider would be the limit? *Answer by Mr. Bushey*—Our lane is about 800 feet long. The longest distance we haul is one half mile. I wouldn't think you would want to haul much farther. That is one limit of the buck rake, you can't go too far from the barn.

Question: What kind of wood do you use for the teeth? *Answer by Mr. Bushey.*—We use fir.

Question: How many minutes does it take to make a round trip of one-quarter mile? *Answer by Mr. Bushey*—About 20 minutes.

Question: Is there a tendency to lose leaves with the buck rake? *Answer by Mr. Bushey*—No.

James Bushey, Sykesville, Maryland, who is Frank Bushey's brother and who lives on an adjoining farm and also has a buck rake, was called upon to add to the discussion. His remarks were as follows: "After Frank and I each had a buck rake we used them to keep barley to the thrasher. Using just the two buck rakes we thrashed 640 bushels of barley in 8 hours. The barley shocks went on the buck rake very nicely. Later we used these buck rakes to bring wheat to the thrasher, but found that it was a little harder to get the wheat shocks on the teeth of the buck rake. We have also used our buck rakes to pick up straw following the combine. We have found that windy weather does not bother us in using the buck rake to pick up either hay or straw. Also, we have found that we can make very sharp turns in picking up hay and yet not miss any hay."

Question: Is it hard to steer the truck? *Answer by Mr. Bushey*—No, it isn't.

Question: How much can you haul? *Answer by Mr. Bushey*—We have hauled as much as 10 shocks of wheat on the buck rake.

Question: In putting the hay in do you just back up to the barn, unload and go out after another load? *Answer by Mr. Bushey*—Yes, that is right.

At this point D. G. Harry, Jr., of Pylesville, was called on to give his experience with the use of a buck rake on his farm. Color slides of Mr. Harry's buck rake were shown. Mr. Harry remarked: "I have been very successful in using the buck rake to haul the soybean and sorghum mixture, shocks of corn, wheat and barley, and in bringing hay into the mow. I do not believe that we would have any trouble in haul-

ing hay with as much as 45% moisture, so long as we do not get too much over 1,000 pounds on the buck rake at any one time.

Question: How many speeds forward does the tractor you built and which was shown in the color slides have? *Answer by Mr. Harry*—Sixteen speeds forward.

W. G. Myers, County Agent of Howard County, stated that in his county they had a buck rake on an Allis Chalmers tractor which was being used very successfully and that it made a round trip to and from the barn in 7 minutes.

Willis Cissel, Woodbine, Maryland, said he had used a buck rake for a couple of years and is using it to fill the silo; also that it works very well in making hay.

Frank Bushey concluded the discussion on the use of buck rakes with the remark that from his experience he would say that the only limit as to the building of a buck rake and as to what can be done with it is the limit of your imagination.

Vere Culver, Manager of Mt. Ararat Farm, Port Deposit, Maryland, was called upon to give his experience with a field hay chopper and mower-crusher. He first discussed the hay mower-crusher as follows: "We bought our mower-crusher from the John Beane Manufacturing Company of Lansing, Michigan. It follows the mower, picks up the hay and runs it through rollers which crush the stems. We have found that this shortens the period needed for drying the hay in the field. The first season we had this machine we cut some very heavy alfalfa hay one day and put it in the barn the next. It was as nice hay as I have ever seen. The few bales we put in after 5 o'clock had picked up some moisture and those were tough and we had a few moldy bales out of them. This machine is not being produced commercially as yet as there are just about five in the country. When they are produced, they will probably be improved and will do a very good job. The greatest results we have obtained in using this machine is with soybeans. Crushing the large soybean stems greatly hastens the curing process. Our particular machine is mounted on rubber. It weighs about 1,500 pounds, with the motor on it, and the draft is fairly heavy."

Question: How expensive are these machines? *Answer by Mr. Culver*—About $350.

Question: Do you think the stems cure as fast as the leaves with this system? *Answer by Mr. Culver*—Yes, they do.

Question: Are the stems more palatable? *Answer by Mr. Culver*—Yes, the cattle eat all of the hay, making very little waste.

Mr. Culver continued his discussion, on the field hay chopper: "We have a Fox River cutter and use it for filling silo rather than for mak-

ing hay. We prefer a pick-up baler to any other form of making hay. However, the hay chopper is a great saver in putting up grass silage. We formerly used 15 or 16 men at silo filling time, accomplishing three tenths of a ton per man per hour. With this harvester and 5 men, we have been able to put up about one and one third tons per man or about four times as much."

Question: Do you unload it by hand? *Answer by Mr. Culver*—Yes.

Question: Do you cut the hay in the field? *Answer by Mr. Culver*—Yes.

Mr. Culver stated that the machine cost around $1,800 and they have used it three years. It has a corn attachment. They used it mostly on soybean and sorghum mixtures.

Question: Have you ever allowed hay to cure and then harvested it and chopped it with this machine? *Answer by Mr. Culver*—No, we haven't, but the machine could be utilized that way.

Harry Devoe, Manager of Indian Springs Farm, Darlington, Maryland, was called upon to give his experience with artificial dehydration. He spoke as follows: "I do not see how I can speak too highly of artificial dehydration as a means of curing hay. Of course, first you have to spend a great many thousands of dollars to install the machine and the operation runs you right up to the point where you question whether it is cheaper or more expensive than sun curing of hay. We try to dehydrate about 100 tons of alfalfa meal each year. Unfortunately, since the war we haven't been able to do anything with it because it is an oil burning machine which burns 30 gallons per hour. The baler, in my mind, has definitely taken the place of dehydration from a practical standpoint. From our experience, we generally cure around 600 tons annually. That is the most economical and most satisfactory way of curing our hay. I do not recommend anyone, unless he has a very large farm, to install the dehydrating system for hay."

Mr. Devoe then made some remarks about putting corn through a thrashing machine. He said they could husk and shell the corn that way and that with a small force of about 7 men it would not be too difficult to get better than 300 bushels of shelled corn in an afternoon. You do get a little bit of cob in the corn and, if the corn is frozen, it will crack some, but if it is not too cold a day it will not crack. He highly recommended putting corn through the thrasher.

Question: What becomes of the cob? *Answer by Mr. Devoe*—The cob goes in with the fodder.

Question: How soon can you start thrashing? *Answer by Mr. Devoe*—As soon as your corn is dry enough to keep as shelled corn.

Question: Do you use the fodder for feeding or bedding? *Answer by Mr. Devoe*—For bedding.

Question: What size thrashing machine? *Answer by Mr. Devoe*—A thrasher with a 28-inch wide cylinder.

J. D. McVean, County Agent, Kent County, said that there was an artificial dehydration system in his county and that it was used to dry alfalfa meal for commercial purposes. It was not used for the farm's own livestock. It makes an excellent alfalfa meal. However, it is better for commercial purposes than just for farm use. From the dirt farmer's standpoint the dehydration system would not be practical, but it is a success in making commercial mixtures.

Professor Carpenter concluded the discussion by saying that hay was one of the most important crops on the farm and has been the least mechanized at the present time. There is more thought being given to improving hay machinery than for any other crop.

Business Meeting—The business meeting was called to order and Fred Jones of the Nominating Committee gave his report. The committee nominated Willis Cissel as President for the coming year; Charles Rutledge as Vice-President and Albin O. Kuhn as Secretary-Treasurer. Roland Mullinix moved that the Nominating Committee report be accepted. This was seconded by W. R. Powel. The motion was carried unanimously. The Auditing Committee, composed of L. A. Renshaw, John W. Magruder and James Galbreath reported that they had audited the books and found them to be correct. Mr. Magruder gave a short report covering the financial status of the organization. Mr. Kuhn moved that the report of the Auditing Committee be accepted. This was seconded by W. R. Powell and passed unanimously. It was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was carried.

REPORT
OF THE
THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
Maryland State Beekeepers' Association

The 35th Annual Meeting of the Maryland State Beekeepers' Ass'n. was held January 22, 1944, in the Francis Scott Key Hotel, Frederick.

In the absence of President Harold L. Kelly, Forest Glen, the meeting was called to order by Secretary George J. Abrams, who then turned the meeting over to former president Lloyd B. Shearman, of Glen Arm.

Dr. E. N. Cory, State Entomologist, discussed the role played by bee culture in rehabilitation of the discharged soldiers following World War I. He said 55 Federal Board men received instruction in bee culture at the University and pointed out the desirability of offering the same opportunity following this war. He urged the building of an adequate bee culture laboratory and honey house at a suitable place on the University campus, where former soldiers and regular students could work and where research could be conducted.

Harold J. Clay, U. S. D. A. War Food Administration, explained the various Federal regulations pertaining to the honey market, and suggested that a committee be appointed to study and make recommendations expressing Maryland's feeling as to whether honey should be rationed and whether a floor should be placed on honey.

Frank Todd, U. S. Bee Culture Laboratory, discussed the importance of pollen to the bee colony. He displayed a pollen trap whereby pollen could be collected for spring feeding. Pointing out that the main cause of retarded spring build-up was an inadequate supply of pollen, he suggested that pollen should be fed to colonies in the spring as a means of obtaining colonies strong enough to do a real pollenizing job in the orchards and to secure full supers from Tulip Poplar.

George J. Abrams, Apiculturist, University of Maryland, reported on the progress being made in eradicating American Foulbrood from the State. Pointing out the loss of four inspectors out of a total of 11, who were in the Armed Service and Red Cross, he gave figures to show that only 3.7% of the apiaries visited had disease and that only 1.3% of the colonies were found infected.

At this point, Dr. L. P. Ditman, Entomologist, University of Maryland, and beeekeper, gave a much appreciated talk on Maryland honey plants, which was rendered especially interesting by use of colored slides.

Following the speaking program, prizes were awarded to winners in the 7th Annual Maryland Honey Sweepstakes. Top cash winners were John Lindner, Cumberland; P. M. Klavuhn, Cumberland; and F. D. Covell, Frederick.

The honey displays in the lobby attracted much attention.

The meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

GEORGE J. ABRAMS
Secretary-Treasurer

REPORT

OF THE

Maryland Vegetable Growers' Association

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Baltimore, Md.

The twenty-fifth annual session was called to order by President Clay P. Whiteford.

Under the general topic, "Should There Be Community Sub-Groups to Present Recommendations to War Board and OPA Relative to Price Ceilings", a report on sweet potatoes by S. H. Rayner was presented by J. P. Brown as follows:

I was invited by Mr. Bruce Church, administrator of Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Division of OPA, to attend a meeting at his office in Washington on December 13, 1943, looking toward establishing ceiling prices on sweet potatoes. There were growers and handlers from Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, New Jersey, and Maryland. A general discussion was held, with each person present giving the cost per acre, yields for 1943, transit risk, packing and storage cost, shrinkage and other information for his particular area. To the question—whether or not prices were to be established according to areas—Mr. Church reported in the negative—there would be one price for the entire nation, and in spite of much historical data establishing the fact that prices varied widely between closely located producing areas, Mr. Church was very firm in insisting that one price would be allowed. Because of the abnormally high production cost during the past season, due to the severe drought in most producing areas, we asked Mr. Church if he thought it would be wise to appoint a sub-committee to prepare our recommendations to be presented to Chester Bowles, Director of the OPA. Mr. Church said that he was not in position to make recommendations for us, but such a procedure would be wise. From the information presented, it would definitely work a hardship on many growers if ceiling prices were established according to the data, upon which such prices must be established ac-

cording to the price control Act, for the remainder of the 1943 crop. Mr. Church also requested that no price mentioned at the meeting be given out for publication.

In my opinion, one factor in the price set-up for the OPA (presented by Miss Leger, OPA economist) that would work a very serious hardship on Maryland farmers, was that no price differential would be allowed between October and November and only a 10¢ per bushel rise in December, as in Maryland potatoes marketed after November 5th to 10th must be taken from storage with a storage cost of 10 to 15¢ and a shrinkage usually averaging 20%. However, in Louisiana, sweet potatoes are handled fresh until the first week in December. This makes the nation-wide set-up practically unworkable. Then, too, it has long been established that Maryland sweet potatoes bring a substantial premium over those produced on the Eastern Shore of Virginia, simply because of the difference in quality, and growers in Maryland have considerably higher expenses, due largely to heavier applications of fertilizer and more intensive culture.

Therefore, it seems that for equitable and workable ceilings, allowance must be included for higher prices for premium quality. I am attaching herewith resolutions which our sub-committee presented to Mr. Carroll, Chief of the food division, and to C. R. Smith of the WFA, and as a result of these meetings and recommendations sweet potato prices were frozen for 60 days beginning December 22nd, at the highest price received for the 5 preceding days. This freeze order may be renewed for 60 days, and in that event will take care of most if not all the 1943 production.

The problem immediately before the sweet potato industry at this time is to make concerted effort that fair and equitable permanent ceilings be established after this freeze order has expired for the 1943 crop, and it seems to me, from the attitude of the men of the OPA with whom we came in contact, this may be possible, provided the facts governing the production, storage and marketing can be properly and honestly presented. Frankly, I was greatly surprised to learn of the little actual experience that those persons charged with establishing ceiling prices on sweet potatoes knew about this crop. Their entire source of information was from "historical data", compiled apparently from the U. S. D. A. crop and market reports of the past 20 years, and all sweet potato growers and handlers know that the varieties and cultural practices, containers and market trends have changed many times during those two decades. Therefore, to assume that figures so compiled would accurately present a current picture of the sweet potato industry is entirely false.

Another factor that I feel should be given consideration at this time is the unit requirements on sweet potato acreage in Selective Service.

In some sections of the country, sweet potatoes are grown as a general farm crop. Here in Maryland they are given the most intensive culture and should certainly be rated as high as tomatoes or similar crops, at one unit per acre instead of two acres per unit. Under the current system, for example, with tomatoes, 3,000 plants are required per acre, whereas with sweet potatoes in Maryland from 12,000 to 14,000 plants are set. The cultivation period is about from May 10th to August 1st, and with normal yields of 200 to 300 bushels per acre the labor at harvest is as great or greater than a ten-ton tomato crop.

Another problem confronting the sweet potato industry, especially in Maryland, is the change in fertilizer analysis for this year. A nitrogen-potash ratio of 1-5 has been found most satisfactory for Maryland Golden variety, but because of the potash shortage this is being changed to 1-4 ratio, and as apparently little experimental work has been conducted with this ratio it seems to us there may be serious risk in the development of too much vegetative growth and a corresponding decrease in tuber production. It seems to be very dangerous to make such a drastic change with the most highly nutritive vegetable crop being grown in our section, and one in which even higher production is desired by the War Food Administration."

J. E. Andrews, reporting for cantaloupes and cucumbers, stated that there was every prospect that ceiling prices would be set up on these crops. It is easy to go into the business, and with good prices everyone goes into it. Prices have ranged from $1.50 to $4.00. The best growers get the best prices, but if the ceiling price is based on the average it penalizes the good grower. It is to be hoped that ceiling prices will be based on the same standards as used for the Western growers.

As to cucumbers, nitrogen was allowed last year for pickles, but not for slicing cucumbers. The price was fixed for small pickles, but not for large "cukes".

F. Ridgely Todd stated that in reference to tomatoes ceiling prices were set without consideration of variations in conditions in different sections. Higher costs make it impossible to put out large acreages unless costs of production can be assured.

A. Lee Towson maintained that a committee should be formed. The only thing which saved the situation last year was the drougth.

Mr. Phillips stated that, relative to setting ceiling prices on vegetables, the public has never enjoyed low prices, no matter how low the prices are to the grower. The Eastern Shore received good prices in Baltimore last year, but the consumer continued to pay normal prices. The same thing would have been true even though the returns to

the grower had not paid the freight. The government can put a ceiling on prices, but it can't put regulations on labor. With ceiling prices, the grower has no chance if he has bad luck.

Dr. C. H. Mahoney noted that New Jersey had already made recommendations on price ceilings. For the grower, it all boils down to getting figures to present a case to the OPA.

A. Lee Towson insisted that a relatively high ceiling gives a lower price to the consumer than a low price ceiling because of a resort to the black market. President Whiteford stated that the greatest problems the canners had were the corn borer and labor. There was too much competition between growers and canners for labor.

Dr. F. B. Bomberger stated that he heartily approved of the setting up of commodity committees. He believed it was a move in the right direction.

It was moved and seconded that the officers be instructed to set up such commodity committees. The motion was carried.

A motion was also passed that those present register their names and addresses, together with the principal vegetable crops grown.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The afternoon meeting was a joint session with the Horticultural Council, at which F. Ridgely Todd presided.

Allen G. Waller, Chief of the Department of Agricultural Economics at New Brunswick, New Jersey, told of the efforts of New Jersey growers to assemble accurate data for presentation to government authorities in relation to ceiling prices. He said that cost of production figures were needed for all crops. The growers in New Jersey are well organized and realize the necessity for presenting a true picture of the situation regarding vegetable production. Retail prices are about the same in low-price years as in high-price years.

Dr. F. B. Bomberger stated that the price levels on canning crops were substantially the same as for last year with slight adjustments in certain areas.

Dwight Walker, Stanley Fulton, and Andrew J. Cohill discussed recommendation of the Fruit Growers' Committee on Price Levels and Ceilings in 1944 for peaches, apples and strawberries.

Stanley Fulton and H. H. Nuttle spoke on the topic "Post War Planning in Horticulture".

The consensus of opinion of the Horticultural Council was that meetings of growers should be held to secure cost data on the different commodities.

Resolutions to be presented to the Maryland Farm Bureau are as follows:

The labor committee for horticultural industries to request that Prison labor not to be used on highways during the growing season, but be allocated to horticultural needs.

Truck Crops. We are opposed to any price ceilings and regulations on fresh fruits and vegetables except when absolutely necessary and workable. If ceilings are imposed, then suitable support prices must be initiated. The regulation attempts to date have decreased rather than increased the acreages of these crops. Faced, as we are, not only with a much higher labor cost, shortage of adequate transportation, higher cost of packages, seeds and fertilizer, but in order to do the job at all we are compelled to use children and such inefficient and unskilled labor, it takes three times the number used under normal conditions. We feel that it is essential these ceilings and regulations be flexible enough to adequately protect the producer in the event of short crops due to conditions beyond his control—the degree of flexibility to be determined by the Federal Administrative Authorities of the State working with representative growers of the affected area. The above would simplify the producers' problems and tend to increase production in line with the "Food for Freedom" program.

Market Information. Since there is no check on truck-lot receipts of various commodities arriving in the different markets of the State, it is impossible for the trade or producers to accurately estimate the supply of any particular commodity in any market.

Sweet Potato Points for Deferment. In reviewing the points allowed by the deferment authorities for several vegetable crops, we find string beans requiring only three months to grow, yet are given 1 point per acre rate. Tomatoes requiring only four months to grow receiving 1 point per acre rate—many other vegetables the same—yet sweet potatoes being a crop that requires at least ten months in growing and marketing taking fully as much labor to prepare plant beds, setting plants, cultivating and harvesting as it does any of the above mentioned crops. In the face of all this, sweet potatoes require 2 acres to obtain 1 point, or 32 acres for the deferment of one man.

This causes an extreme hardship on the sweet potato growers of Maryland. We most earnestly petition that this unfair condition be corrected and suggest that they be placed on a 1 point per acre basis.

Marshall Heaps was elected president of the Horticultural Council for 1944.

Officers elected by the Maryland Vegetable Growers Association are:

President, J. E. Andrews, Hurlock.

Vice-President, A. Lee Towson, Chestertown.

Secretary-Treasurer, W. R. Ballard, College Park.

Director (3-year term), C. C. Phillips, Quantico.

Director for Farm Bureau, George H. Stratman, Sparrows Point.

Delegate to Farm Bureau, Egbert Hawkins, Harmans.

A. Morris Todd, for the auditing committee reported that the Treasurer's accounts had been examined and found satisfactory. The balance on hand as of December 31, 1943 was $41.89.

The Potato and Vegetable Exhibit was about as large as usual despite transportation difficulties.

Following is the list of awards:

GROUP I. Adult Certified

Name	*Address*	*Amount*
Class I. Irish Cobbler.		
1. J. W. Aydellotte	Salisbury	$4.00
2. Williard T. Pilchard	Pocomoke	3.00
3. Wm. F. DeBerry	Oakland	2.00
4. Wm. P. DeBerry	Oakland	1.50
5. Robert V. DeBerry	Oakland	1.00
Class II. Any Other Early or Medium Early Variety.		
1. Wm. F. DeBerry	Oakland—Warba	4.00
2. Wm. P. DeBerry	Oakland—Pawnee	3.00
3. Robert DeBerry	Oakland—Mesaba	2.00
4. Mrs. Wm. F. DeBerry	Oakland—Kasota	1.50
Class III. Any Late Variety.		
1. Robert Miller	Accident—Early Maine Smooth Rural	4.00
2. Wm. Cissel Simpson	Clarksville—Dakota Red	3.00
3. Evans Chaney	Laurel—Sebago	2.00
4. Wm. P. DeBerry	Oakland—Green Mountain	1.50
5. Walter C. DeBerry	Oakland—Russet Rural	1.00
Class IV. Sweet Potatoes		
1. Robert L. Williams	Salisbury—Maryland Golden	4.00
2. Edgar L. Williams	Salisbury—Maryland Golden	3.00

GROUP II. Adult Commercial

Class V. Irish Cobbler.		
1. Roosevelt Gilardi	Boonsboro	4.00
2. S. Seymor Smith	Long Green	3.00
3. Margaret Lohr	Oakland	2.00
4. Robert DeBerry	Oakland	1.50
5. Carl Lohr	Oakland	1.00
6. Wm. P. DeBerry	Oakland	1.00

Name	Address	Amount
Class VI. Any Other Early Variety.		
1. Wm. F. DeBerry,	Oakland—Pawnee	4.00
2. Walter DeBerry,	Oakland—Pawnee	3.00
3. Wm. P. DeBerry,	Oakland—Warba	2.00
4. Robert De Berry,	Oakland—Warba	1.50
5. Mrs. Wm. P. DeBerry,	Oakland—Pawnee	1.00
6. Anna DeBerry,	Oakland—Mesaba	1.00
Class VII. Any Medium Early or Medium Late Variety		
1. Roosevelt Gilardi,	Boonsboro—Katahdin	4.00
2. Wm. F. DeBerry,	Oakland—Katahdin	3.00
3. Mrs. Wm. DeBerry,	Oakland—Earlaine #2	2.00
4. Mrs. Wm. P. DeBerry,	Oakland—Earlaine #2	1.50
5. Wm. P. DeBerry,	Oakland—Katahdin	1.00
6. Robert DeBerry,	Oakland—Katahdin	1.00
Class VIII. Rural (Smooth or Russet)		
1. Robert Miller,	Accident—Early Maine Smooth	4.00
2. Ray Miller,	Accident—Early Maine Smooth	3.00
3. Lloyd Miller,	Accident—Smooth	2.00
4. Mrs. Wm. P. DeBerry,	Oakland—Mason Smooth	1.50
5. W. Benson DeBerry,	Oakland—Pioneer Smooth	1.00
6. Richard Lohr,	Oakland—Pioneer Smooth	1.00
Class IX. Sequoia.		
1. Wm. Cissel Simpson,	Clarksville	4.00
2. Mrs. Wm. Cissel Simpson,	Clarksville	3.00
3. Evans Chaney,	Laurel	2.00
4. George Simpson,	Clarksville	1.50
5. Robert DeBerry,	Oakland	1.00
6. Wm. P. DeBerry,	Oakland	1.00
Class X. Any Other Late Variety.		
1. S. Seymor Smith,	Long Green—Dakota Red	4.00
2. Jesse Carter,	Long Green—Dakota Red	3.00
3. Wm. Cissel Simpson,	Clarksville—Pontiac	2.00
4. W. Benson DeBerry,	Oakland—Green Mountain	1.50
5. Wm. P. DeBerry,	Oakland—Potomac	1.00
6. Carl W. Lohr,	Oakland—Green Mountain	1.00
Class XI. Sweet Potatoes—Maryland Golden Sweet.		
1. Mollie E. Parker,	Salisbury	4.00
2. Edgar L. Williams,	Salisbury	3.00
3. Joseph H. Parker,	Salisbury	2.00
4. Robert L. Williams,	Salisbury	1.50
5. John S. Parker,	Salisbury	1.00
Class XII. Sweet Potatoes—Any Variety.		
1. Joseph H. Parker,	Salisbury—Big Stem Sweets	4.00
2. Lawrence Gilardi,	Boonsboro—Jersey Sweets	3.00

GROUP III. 4-H Club Certified and Commercial

Class XIII. Early Varieties.		
1. Richard Holter,	Jefferson—Irish Cobbler	4.00
2. Robert H. Holter,	Jefferson—Irish Cobbler	3.00
3. Cissel K. Holter, Jr.,	Jefferson—Irish Cobbler	2.00

Name	*Address*	*Amount*
4. Gratton Remsburg,	Keedysville—Irish Cobbler	1.50
5. Edwin Burtner,	Keedysville—Irish Cobbler	1.00
6. Roger Burtner,	Keedysville—Irish Cobbler	1.00

Class XIV. Medium Late Varieties.

1. Billy Simpson,	Clarksville—Pontiac	4.00
2. George Simpson,	Clarksville—Pontiac	3.00
3. Gratton Remsburg,	Keedysville—Katahdin	2.00
4. Edwin Burtner,	Keedysville—Green Mountain	1.50
5. Roger Burtner,	Keedysville—Katahdin	1.00

Class XV. Late Varieties.

1. Robert Miller,	Accident—Early Maine Smooth Rural	4.00
2. Ray Miller,	Accident—Early Maine Smooth Rural	3.00
3. George Simpson,	Clarksville—Dakota Red	2.00
4. Billy Simpson,	Clarksville—Dakota Red	1.50
5. Edwin Burtner,	Keedysville—Rural	1.00
6. Gratton Remsburg,	Keedysville—Rural	1.00

GROUP IV. F. F. A. Certified & Commercial

Class XVI. Early Varieties.

1. William Iland,	Brooksville—Irish Cobbler	4.00
2. Walden Burtner,	Boonsboro—Irish Cobbler	3.00

Class XVII. Medium Late Varieties.

1. George Simpson,	Clarksville, Pontiac	4.00
2. Walden Burtner,	Boonsboro—Green Mountain	3.00
3. Harold Remsburg,	Keedysville—Blue Peerless	2.00

Class XVIII. Late Varieties.

1. Robert Miller,	Accident—Smooth Rural	4.00
2. Ray Miller,	Accident—Early Maine Smooth	3.00
3. George Simpson,	Clarksville—Dakota Red	2.00
4. Walden Burtner,	Boonsboro—Rurals	1.50

VEGETABLES

Class XX. Best 3 heads cabbage—Flathead type.

1. R. W. Burtner,	Sharpsburg	4.00
2. Leroy Burtner,	Sharpsburg	3.00

Class XXI. Best 3 heads cabbage—Ballhead type.

1. Lawrence Gilardi,	Boonsboro	4.00
1. R. W. Burtner,	Sharpsburg	4.00
3. Leroy Burtner,	Sharpsburg	2.00

Class XXII. Best 16 Yellow Onions.

1. O. W. Burtner,	Keedysville	4.00
2. R. W. Burtner,	Sharpsburg	3.00
3. Lawrence Gilardi,	Boonsboro	2.00
4. Jacob Burtner,	Boonsboro	1.50

Class XXIII. Best 12 Carrots.

1. R. W. Burtner,	Sharpsburg	4.00
2. Lawrence Gilardi,	Boonsboro	3.00

Name	*Address*	*Amount*
3. Roosevelt Gilardi,	Boonsboro	2.00
4. Jacob Burtner,	Boonsboro	1.50

Class XXIV. Best 12 *Parsnips.*

1.		
2. R. W. Burtner,	Sharpsburg	4.00
3. Jacob Burtner,	Boonsboro	3.00

Class XXV. Best 16 *Turnips.*

1. Leroy Burtner,	Sharpsburg	4.00
2. R. W. Burtner,	Sharpsburg	3.00
3. Howard W. Burtner,	Keedysville	2.00
4. Lawrence Gilardi,	Boonsboro	1.50

Class XXVI. Best 16 *Turnips.*

1. Lawrence Gilardi,	Boonsboro	4.00
2. R. W. Burtner,	Sharpsburg	3.00

Class XXVII. Best 3 *Pound Basket of Mushrooms.*

1. Henry Clay Mushroom Company,	Whiteford	4.00

REPORT

OF THE

Maryland Stockmen's Association

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

January 12, 1944

Baltimore, Maryland

Joseph W. Shirley, Jr., Vice President, opened the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Maryland Stockmen's Association in the Lord Baltimore Hotel, Baltimore, Maryland.

Mr. Shirley stated that due to unavoidable circumstances the President, Richard C. Riggs, was unable to attend the meeting. He outlined briefly the activities of the association during the year 1943 and expressed his hopes for the association in 1944.

NEW METHODS OF CONTROLLING INTERNAL PARASITES IN LIVESTOCK

A. O. Foster, Parasitologist, Bureau of Animal Industry
Agricultural Research Administration

The time is altogether too short to say all that should be said about the subject at hand. Our discussion must, therefore, be limited to a statement about phenothiazine and to considerations of its use to achieve effective control of internal parasites.

Phenothiazine is a synthetic coal-tar derivative—an organic chemical compound—that has become, in less than 5 years since the discovery of its anthelmintic action, the most widely used of all drugs for removal of internal parasites of farm animals. It does not kill all parasites, but it is effective against most of the economically important stomach and intestinal roundworms. It is used in more kinds of livestock and possesses effective action against a wider range of parasites than any other drug of its class. Currently, it is being used in this country at the rate of about 3 million pounds annually; it is also being used in many other countries, especially the British Empire and its Dominions. The supply appears to be ample, but the chemical from which phenothiazine is made, diphenylamine, is employed in the manufacture of nearly all explosives, war gases, and rubber. Therefore, phenothiazine is ammunition and, like ammunition, it should be used not too sparingly, but wisely and effectively.

How To Administer

There is no preferred method of administering phenothiazine; it may be given to animals in almost any manner that one chooses. Standard doses of the powder may be given in capsules or admixed with feed, or they may be incorporated into home-made drenches for administration with syringes, stomach tubes, or ordinary pop bottles. The drug is distributed by veterinary supply houses and manufacturers, and is obtainable in proprietary products specifically designed for administration as drenches, tablets, boluses, pellets, and capsules. A wettable product is marketed which has the advantage of ready dilution with water for use in drenching. Self-medication with loose mixtures of phenothiazine and salt is a means of employing the drug that is being used increasingly as a measure for controlling internal parasites of sheep and goats. Group treatments—involving usually administration of the drug in feed—may be used to advantage for sheep, goats, swine, and poultry but, in whatever manner the drug is administered, horses and cattle should be dosed individually. The fasting of animals before treatment, or administration of purgatives with the treatment or afterwards, is not necessary and is generally inadvisable.

Treating animals and controlling parasites are not the same thing. Treatments are given to remove parasites; control measures are designed to protect livestock from serious parasitism—to prevent sickness and death from parasitic worms. Control is sometimes accomplished without drugs. It is a mistake, nevertheless, to think that treatments to remove or destroy internal parasites are useful only for saving the lives of parasitized animals and for ameliorating parasitic diseases. Curing animals that suffer from heavy parasitism is not a "stitch in time"; it is scarcely more than a procedure of last resort. A cardinal feature of parasitism is that parasites develop in definite cycles and the essence of controlling parasites is to break the chain of development at its weakest link. This can be done often by timely treatment to remove the adult worms, hence it may be emphasized that the chief objective of medication against parasites is to prevent disease by destroying sources of infection.

Adult worms in breeding stock are often the chief sources of infection because they produce the eggs that pass out onto the pastures and develop into infective stages that attack the young stock. Moreover, there is increasing evidence that the infective larval stages of many internal parasites do not survive on pastures in winter, and in spite of the fact that most parasitism is acquired when the animals swallow the larvae during the grazing seasons, the adult worms in breeding stock are chiefly responsible for initial contamination of spring pastures. Between seasons, in northerly climates, parasites owe their perpetuation chiefly to the fact that adult worms are carried over winter in the

breeding stock. Consequently, use of an efficient anthelmintic before the grazing season begins is the best way to protect stock from many kinds of internal parasites.

Administration of phenothiazine in salt, which is typically a grazing season measure and is admirably suited for controlling parasites of sheep and goats, is an exception to this rule. It is a control measure that attacks, not the adult worm chiefly, but the pre-infective stages that develop in and from eggs that are passed in the feces of parasitized animals. The first investigation undertaken to determine this feasibility of controlling sheep parasites by the method of free access to mixtures of phenothiazine and salt was undertaken to determine the precise effects upon parasites of the daily ingestion by sheep of minimal amounts of the drug. It was found that a daily intake of less than ½ gram per sheep prevented development of infective larvae from worm eggs that were passed in the feces of the treated sheep.

Sheep Parasites

Everything considered, we are better prepared to control sheep parasites than those of other animals. Sheep and lambs are not, of course, of more importance than other classes of livestock, but events early in the war focussed particular attention upon them. Owing to the difficulty of obtaining customary supplies from Australia, we and our allies had to count heavily upon our sheep for wool, pelts, and surgical catgut. The sudden necessity for better parasite control on account of a shortage of surgical suture material came as a surprise, but we had been aware for a long time of the desirability of controlling nodular-worm disease for purely economic reasons. Moreover, the chief threats to the welfare of our sheep were, and are, of parasitic origin.

The problem was surprisingly simple; most problems are after the solution is reached. The nodular-worm situation is wholly one of prevention. Young worms that are in nodules of the small and large intestine are beyond the reach of drugs and there is no remedy for resolving a nodular condition that already exists. In other words, there is no cure. Phenothiazine had come auspiciously into being only a short while before. (The anthelmintic properties of this chemical were first reported by the Bureau of Animal Industry five years ago last month.) In addition to its other advantages, phenothiazine removes adult nodular worms; it is the only satisfactory anthelmintic against these worms. Studies showed that the infective stages of nodular worms, which sheep and lambs swallow during grazing, do not survive the winter in regions where successive grazing seasons are separated by moderately severe winters; that the greatest number of adult worms is present in the intestine of sheep in late winter or early spring in consequence of the continued emergence of worms from nodules during the first three or four months following the previous grazing season; that,

in short, the parasites owe their perpetuation to the fact that they are carried over the winter in the breeding stock.

The natural solution was, of course, winter medications. After two years of testing this hypothesis on our experimental flock at Beltsville —to make a long story short—we were thoroughly satisfied with the results. On account of the effective action of phenothiazine against most of the econmically significant stomach and intestinal parasites of sheep, a program of controlling sheep parasites was formulated which consisted essentially in administration of one or two doses of phenothiazine (25 grams)—one given in late fall or early winter, soon after the close of the grazing season, the other given in late winter or early spring, just before the beginning of the next grazing season. This program of winter treatment has been used by many sheep raisers and considerable success has been reported with it.

Medicated Salt

Another development that paralleled this one is the administration of phenothiazine in salt. Attempts have been made for years to control parasites with salt licks and other forms of medicated salt, but none has been successful. Preliminary testing showed that use of phenothiazine in salt gave promise of being the exception, and this method of administration as a measure for controlling internal parasites seemed especially significant, partly because it was evident that winter medication of breeding stock would not solve the problem for sections of the country (parts of Texas and Florida for example) where there is no significant winter and where the sheep are grazed most or all of the year.

I strongly believe those of you who are sheep raisers should give serious consideration to treating your sheep now before spring grazing begins in order to prevent contamination of spring pastures by destroying the seedbeds of infections. Then, with the beginning of the grazing season, you should consider allowing your sheep free access to a 1 to 9 mixture of phenothiazine and loose salt. Mr. Outhouse has had good results with a combination of 1 part of phenothiazine and 9 parts of mineral mixture.

It would be a mistake to say nothing about controlling parasites in other animals, particularly cattle, horses, poultry, and swine, all of which represent more important industries in this state than do sheep. With some exceptions, the principles are the same, the object being to treat to prevent disease by destroying sources of infection.

In general, what has been said about sheep applies equally to goats.

Parasites in Cattle

For removing stomach and intestinal parasites from cattle, phenothiazine is also the drug of choice. As a general rule, adult cattle rarely

suffer from serious parasitism, but heavy losses in calves are frequently traceable to parasites. No suitable means has yet been developed for administering the drug in salt to these host animals, and such a method of administration may not be feasible. Moreover, there is not good experimental evidence as to when it is best to treat in order to get best results. Calves usually pick up infections pretty early, however, and for this reason it is probably advisable to treat them with 15-to-20-gram doses of phenothiazine soon after they begin to graze. Such doses may be given in small amounts over a period of 3 or more days, if desired. Animals up to 2, and perhaps 3, years of age should probably be treated before each grazing season, and at other times if conditions indicate the need for treatment.

Parasites in Horses

Phenothiazine is the most efficient drug for removing stronglyles from horses and, looking at the record as a whole, this drug may be regarded as a reasonably safe equine anthelmintic if employed in doses of about one ounce for the average horse. Nearly everyone now appears to favor one treatment preliminary to the spring grazing season as the most promising method of controlling strongylosis, with additional treatments given when and if necessary. One of the most interesting and practical suggestions regarding the treatment of horses originated several months ago at the University of Illinois and consists in combined treatment with phenothiazine and carbon disulfide. The important internal parasites of horses are bots, stomach worms, large roundworms, and strongyles. Carbon disulfide is efficacious against the first three and phenothiazine removes the strongyles, hence this one combined treatment solves all the parasite problems at one time.

Parasites in Swine and Poultry

With both swine and poultry, there is increasing evidence that anthelmintic control of parasitism is less effective and less satisfactory than control achieved through rigid sanitation and good feeding. Phenothiazine and other anthelmintics may be used to advantage in both of these classes of stock when circumstances indicate the need for medication to remove internal parasites, but there is no wholly satisfactory general anthelmintic for swine and, in case of poultry, phenothiazine is chiefly useful for removal of cecal worms.

The Federal Bureau of Animal Industry is endeavoring to cooperate to the fullest extent with farmers and stockmen, and is prepared to furnish information at its command on matters pertaining to animal parasites and their control.

Finally, what we have already discussed deals chiefly with control of parasites by appropriate and timely treatment with phenothiazine. Medicinal prophylaxis of livestock parasitism must not, of course, be

regarded as a substitute for hygienic management of animals. Good, clean pastures and properly balanced rations are always desirable and the resting and shifting of pastures are sound practices. Indeed, it is upon these practices and other general measures of sanitation that the well-being of livestock largely depends.

A LIVESTOCK CONSERVATION PROGRAM

DR. FRED H. LEINBACH, Head of Department of Animal Husbandry, University of Maryland

In the skit which was just presented, one gathers that the meaning of livestock conservation is the guarding, protecting and marshalling our livestock resources to obtain maximum production of meat and other animal products from available feed and manpower. It calls for a more efficient type of production, one which is altogether attainable and one which in the aggregate means increased food supplies and a higher net income for the individual producer who practices it.

A conservative estimate of the annual loss sustained by the livestock industry from the more important diseases and parasites is nearly one-half billion dollars. The loss from failure to adopt generally improved production methods which are in use by only a relatively small percentage of our better producers is probably even greater than that resulting from diseases and parasites combined. From these figures it can be estimated readily that the average livestock producer is carrying an additional and unnecessary item in his cost of doing business amounting to approximately 10 percent of his gross sales. This is indeed a serious condition. First, we need every bit of the products we can produce and then even more; second, we haven't feed to waste; and, third, it just isn't economically sound to tolerate such wastes.

We have witnessed already in many sections a liquidation of commercial breeding stocks. It is always a wise procedure to eliminate from our herds and flocks the inefficient breeding animals. Wise producers make this a regular practice. The liquidation I'm referring to is not that kind. It includes such items as sending sows close up to farrowing to markets already badly overloaded—glutting the market with unfinished young animals which aren't suitable for slaughter purposes, but which must nevertheless be slaughtered because there is no other place to put them. Why? Because feed supplies have become limited and partially because producers have become panicky.

Eliminate Wastes

There is just one sensible way to get the production needed and that is by eliminating the unnecessary wastes we've been tolerating. A few examples may serve to illustrate this point.

The average pig when born represents a feed investment of 140 pounds. This includes the feed invested in raising the dam and sire to breeding age and that fed the sow during the pregnancy and nursing period. A saving of one additional pig per litter in 1943 would have allowed the same total production of pork with but 86 percent as many sows and in addition would have saved 51 million bushels of grain, even assuming all litter death losses occurred at farrowing time.

Farm surveys made in a midwestern state showed that hog men using approved sanitation methods raised from 1.6 to 2.7 more pigs per litter than others who produced theirs under the permanent hog lot system. In addition, the pigs were more thrifty and far more efficient producers because they weren't worm infested. Yet a goodly proportion of our hogs are still being produced under the permanent hog lot system.

An Average hog producer in this country feeds 495 pounds of grain for 100 pounds of live pork produced. If he markets his hogs at a weight of 200 pounds each there is a feed investment per hog of 990 pounds. Yet, the top half of our hog producers are making their 200-pound hog at a feed investment of 850 pounds, or 2½ bushels less per hog. Think of the tremendous saving of grain which might have been effected could the efficiency of the lower group of producers been raised to that of the upper half. We have in this state our share of both kinds of these producers.

Cholera Losses

Let us consider our national losses from hog cholera. The incidence of this disease during the past two years has been at all-time low, yet before the 1943 pigs are all marketed we may expect a mortality of over 2 million head from this disease, which will result in a waste of some 20 million bushels of grain and 200 million pounds of needed meat supplies. It is possible to greatly reduce this loss.

Between parasites and unenforced dog laws, this state's sheep production has greatly decreased during the past few years. In my mind, sheep have become uneconomical on far more farms because of worms than because of dogs. The development of phenothiazine and the ease of administration of this drug promises to simplify our parasite control problem greatly. Certainly, the combination of sheep and parasites isn't a good one and doesn't add up to many profit dollars for the sheepman. The high percentage of pee-wee or cull lambs reaching our markets each fall affords a good measure of what needs to be and can be done by sheep producers in livestock conservation.

Bang's Disease

Bang's disease still exacts an enormous toll from beef producers. Fortunately, it is a disease for which good methods of control have been

developed and these need to be applied more generally. Our beef producers are in a favored position in that they have so few real serious diseases to contend with. However, I'm afraid too many of us pay far too little attention to the percentage calf crop we raise. Are we culling our herds intelligently? If not, we can't hope to attain maximum calf crops and top efficiency of production. The cows in the herd ought to be evaluated individually and regularly, the shy or barren cows eliminated as soon as detected, along with those whose calves fail to measure up in efficiency. When a beef cow enters the breeding herd, we have a right to expect from her a calf per yar, a calf which is right in conformation, and one which receives enough milk during the suckling period to attain maximum size. It takes intelligent care and handling plus the right kind of animals in the herd to attain this.

There is a distinct possibility that during the present winter season many market and breeding animals may not be fed adequately, either on a quantitative or qualitative basis. It is absolutely essential and a challenge to all of us to see that pertinent information relating to nutrition of farm animals be gotten to producers in simple, understandable language so that efficiency of production will not be lowered to prevent any permanent damage to breeding stock.

I could not leave this subject without mention of the gains which improved breeding can bring about in increasing efficiency of our animal units. We have come a long ways by the use of more and better purebred sires, but we are still a long way from our goal. The vast differences in the utilization of feed by offspring of different sires where these are handled under similar conditions leads me to the statement that we have scarcely scratched the surface in this direction.

I am convinced that the livestock industry in Maryland is sound. Someday we may have to meet outside competition for our markets. We must eliminate the wastes and otherwise increase our efficiency of production to do this. We can and we will, but we must begin now.

THE ARMY MEAT PROGRAM

MAJOR JOSEPH B. CORNS, Officer in Charge, Quartermaster
Market Center, Baltimore, Maryland

It is a pleasure to appear before you, the Maryland Stockmen's Association, and to bring to you some of the highlights of the Army Meat Program as it may affect you both directly and indirectly. I consider that you would be particularly interested in such phases of this program as: (a) the use of meat in the Army diet; (b) the methods used in procurement of meat for the Armed Services; and (c) the methods of conservation of meat by the Quartermaster Corps and its effect on civilian consumption.

No doubt, most of you have sons or daughters, brothers or sisters, in the Armed Forces doing their bit in this country or on the fighting

fronts in different parts of the world. You are accordingly keenly interested in knowing more about the food which they are served, with especial reference to meats.

It is said that the "Army marches on its stomach". Accordingly in this year of 1944, as this offensive warfare is waged on the many fronts throughout the world, food like ammunition, must be supplied in unlimited quantities if we are to expect victory. Too much time cannot be given to the careful preparation of the menu, the procurement of the best food available, and the proper cooking of this food. Far more study and preparation has been given to menu planning, food procurement, and food preparation than was the case in World War I. These operations have not been left to chance, but have been carried out by some of the best trained officers and civilians in the country. You can be assured that the feeding of the troops is not left to chance, but is in very good hands.

Specifically, you livestock raisers are interested in the use which is made of meat on the Army menus. Since you produce much of this beef and pork, you would like to know whether good use is made of it. Meat is of first importance on the menu. Not only does the average soldier eat more meat than any other fighting man in the world, but he gets a variety that is not surpassed even on the finest civilian dinner table, according to the War Department. A soldier is served about one pound of meat per day. This includes all types of meat, but the mainstay is beef.

A study of the monthly menu will reveal that roast beef is served on the average of at least three or four times a month, which is a lot oftener than hash, meat loaf or stew appear on the bill of fare. Veal, either roasted or in cutlets, is a very popular meat and is occasionally served even oftener than beef, the exact number of times depending mainly on whether its price is reasonable or not.

Pork customarily has a high position on the monthly menu. The number of times per month may vary depending upon the price and the season of year.

Chicken and lamb are usually on the menu two or three times a month and baked ham is served at least once or twice. Lamb has generally proved to be the least popular of all meats. Bacon appears often as a breakfast dish and occasionally in salads.

Probably beef will never be challenged seriously as the number one meat in the Army mess. It is first in popularity and appears more often on the master menu because it can be served in an almost infinite variety of ways, such as stews, meat loaf, hash, braised, in a pie or in goulash.

On the basis of the foregoing facts, I think you will come to the conclusion that meat holds a place of first importance in the diet, that the soldiers are getting ample quantities of meat, far in excess of that

consumed per capita by civilians, and that such meat is prepared as wholesome and palatable dishes.

In the South and Southwest Pacific theaters of operation, increasing amounts of beef, pork, and lamb are being supplied from Australia and New Zealand. Development of these sources and utilization of these supplies of meat in the Pacific. Area are resulting in marked decrease in such supplies to be shipped from this country. Such a program will not only conserve our supply of meat for this country and for shipment to the European theater of operation, but is effecting an enormous saving in shipping. This reduces the shipping distance between 6,000 and 7,000 miles from that which would be required for shipping from our West Coast. This conservation of shipping and the expediting of food supplies from Australia and New Zealand to our fighting fronts in the Far Pacific Area should be of considerable value in helping to overcome our supply problems in that area.

Meat procurement for the Army, or more correctly for all the Armed Services, is a function of the Quartermaster General and is directly controlled by Brig. General Carl A. Hardigg, Chief of Subsistence Branch, Office of the Quartermaster General. The actual procurement is done by Field Headquarters, Perishable Section, Subsistence Branch, O.Q.M.G., Chicago, Illinois, and the 35 Market Centers located throughout the United States. In addition to these 35, there is one Market Center in Canada. The meat procurement system was first centralized in Chicago and in a few of the principal market centers located in important centers of the packing industry. Baltimore was one of these cities, the office having been established about two and one-half years ago. The procurement has now been decentralized so that a large number of market centers over the country are procuring meat and meat products.

Due to inability of the Army to secure adequate supplies from the offerings from packers, it was necessary to invoke set-aside orders to obtain requirements. Such a set-aside was a method of obtaining equable quantities from all packers, both large and small. With the set-aside orders the Army buying has been made easier in securing supplies for most of its requirements, both domestic and for overseas. In this connection I wish to remind you again that this so-called Army buying includes for all Armed Services, namely; Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard. The percentage for meat set-aside varies from time to time depending upon the availability of supplies, the demand, and the voluntary offerings made by packers. Currently, the Armed Services are taking about 23 percent of all beef and much smaller percentages of the other meats.

With the set-aside orders from the government to secure ample meat for the Army there was need for a decentralization of the buying pro-

gram, so that the set-aside of meat all over the country could be bought locally by Army meat buyers located in the market centers of those particular districts. This worked to the advantage of the Army in procurement and to the advantage of the livestock producers and packers in disposing of supplies quickly to the Army in the immediate district in which the packing houses were located. With this present system of buying, all the set-aside meat is bought by the nearest market center and only the deficit for the market center must be brought in from more distant points; thus an improvement in the system of distribution with a reduction in transportation. Currently, the Baltimore market center can secure locally about 60 to 75 percent of its beef requirements.

Procurement has been made difficult by carlot price differential; however, this is not so true with repect to beef where there is only a 25 cents per hundred reduction for carlot. Unwillingness of producers to sell at ceiling prices has further made procurement increasingly difficult. This holding of livestock from the market resulted in decreased supplies to meet the requirements of the Armed Service.

At this point, it may be well to correct a popular misconception that the Army is hoarding meat, resulting in decreased supplies for civilians. The Army does not hoard meat, except for use overseas, which is vital for successful prosecution of the War. Obviously, it is necessary to carry rather large stocks of boneless beef, semi-boneless pork loins, hams and bacon for overseas shipments. It would be entirely impractical to depend upon the seasonal offerings to handle these overseas requirements. Supplies must be readily available at the ports, or in easy access thereto, on very short notice. Overseas movements take precedent over other shipments and failure to make the necessary loading is inexcusable.

Except for overseas shipments, the Army has only very small stocks on hand, no more than for a few days or at the most a few weeks supply. A large amount of the meat supplies for camps in this country is on wheels enroute to camps. Any unusual delays enroute may result in temporary meat supplies at local camps; however this is handled by substituting other kinds of meats which are available or by the substitution of seafood.

In the furtherance of conservation of meat and other foodstuffs for their fuller utilization by the Armed Forces, the Quartermaster Corps has adopted some of the following practices which will indirectly result in greater supplies for the civilian population. *First*—The Army now has the quivalent of one "meatless day" a week, but it comes in the form of three meatless meals on three different days. This policy alone saves about 7,000,000 pounds of meat a week. *Second*—The Quartermaster Corps leaves no stone unturned to save as much food as possible and to combat waste. All kitchen greases are salvaged and sold for conversion into glycerine for explosives and into material for soap. How-

ever, recently a campaign was conducted through the Army upon proper methods of rendering and re-using fats. The proper method of rendering was determined after long research by the National Livestock and Meat Board. The fats thus rendered are re-used for kitchen or baking purposes. Garbage is sold to farmers who raise hogs. This last point should be of interest to you hog raisers. *Third*—The Quartermaster Corps commenced careful steps to cut down the use of the so-called "scarce" foods more than a year before civilian rationing started. By means of systematic revision of allowances, the Army's per-man consumption of such items as coffee, sugar, butter and meat was scaled down over a period of many months at no detriment to the soldier, but to the benefit of the civilian consumer. *Fourth*—The Army cooks are taught to plan meals carefully and to use left-overs from one meal to make different dishes at the following meal. It is stressed continually that these left-overs must be prepared in an appetizing fashion and they are often embodied in soups. Such practices are resulting in considerable savings on meat and other foodstuffs. In this connection master menus are prepared 90 days in advance, which permits the meeting of seasonable and predictable shortages.

Doubtless you will be interested in the kinds, types, and grades of meat procured for domestic and overseas use. Beef and pork are more extensively used than any other type, but the Army makes good use of smoked meats, lamb, veal, fish, and poultry. At the present time, only carcass beef is used for camps, posts, and stations in this country, except for issuance to some small messes of 20 men or less, in which case boneless beef is used. Carcass beef, due to its bulk, difficulty of handling, both on the refrigerator ships and overseas, is never shipped. Instead, frozen boneless beef is used exclusively. The principal pork items for consumption in domestic camps include ham, bacon, pork loins, butts, shoulders, spareribs, sausage, and cold cuts.

For overseas shipment by the Quartermaster Corps the principal pork items include semi-boneless pork loins, overseas smoked ham, bacon, and frankfurters (60% pork and 40% beef or vice versa). Semi-boneless pork loins are used extensively for overseas shipment due to their compactness with a minimum amount of shipping space required because all the bottom bone has been removed.

In addition to the fresh and frozen beef and pork used here and overseas, large quantities are processed in the form of canned meats and meat products. The canned meats and meat products are used extensively overseas, due to their compactness, ease of handling, and shipping in which no refrigeration is required; also due to ease of preparation.

WAR-TIME MEAT PROBLEMS

WELLS E. HUNT, Schluderberg-Kurdle Company and the U. S. Department of Agriculture War Meat Board.

Mr. Hunt gave a very clear explanation of the operation of the War Meat Board, the different Bureaus and Agencies which allocate animals

to the packers and the position of the packer who is trying to supply both the army and civilian meat needs.

Noon

The Maryland Hampshire Swine Breeders held a Ham and Bacon Breakfast during the luncheon hour. The menu was built around 100 percent Hampshire ham and bacon.

Afternoon Session

THE FEED OUTLOOK

K. L. TURK, Department of Dairy Husbandry, University of Maryland

In discussing our feed situation, I should like, if it were possible, to bring you a bright and encouraging outlook. To do so, however, would not be realistic, and I am inclined to believe you are interested in knowing the facts. Some recent measures may have improved the outlook. Perhaps there are additional measures that can be taken; however, we are still faced with the fundamental fact that our livestock population is out of balance with feed supplies.

In order to stimulate production in 1942, wide margins were established by Government order between feed costs and prices of livestock. Such a policy, plus our needs for increased production, resulted in large increases in livestock numbers. This was especially true with hogs and poultry. According to the ten-year average, we normally raise about 73,000,000 pigs each year; yet in 1942 we raised 105,000,000 head, and 122,000,000 head in 1943. The Maryland fall pig crop is the largest on record and about one-fourth larger than the fall of 1942. When these large increases began, everything was fine because we had large accumulated surpluses of feed grain throughout the country. It is now obvious that we have used up these surpluses, our reserves of bread grains for human food have been considerably depleted, our feed supplies have declined, and until very recently, our livestock populations have continued to increase.

Under usual conditions with free play of prices, normal adjustments take place. As supplies become less abundant, feeding ratios tend to become less favorable and a warning signal is given to producers and production goes down. Price has served this function; yet with frozen prices and Government control, all the natural processes are eliminated. If the Government is going to continue its control of food production, it will need to make price adjustments more promptly and adequately.

It has been apparent to a majority of people for many months that the corn-hog price relationship was out of balance with everything else. The ceiling price on corn has not held feed prices down. As you know, up until December 6, 1943, there were no ceiling prices on oats,

barley and grain sorghums, and they went up $15.00 to $20.00 per ton in price. Of necessity, they were substituted for corn. We have continued to use wheat for feed at a rate which, if continued, might lead to a serious bread shortage. Incidentally, the outlook for this year's wheat corp is now very poor. All the laws of chance and the weather are against us raising as good crops in 1944 as we raised in 1942 and 1943.

Protein Shortage

A year ago last November we ran into a serious shortage of protein ingredients. The country as a whole has suffered from this shortage since that time. The Protein Conservation Program established last year and generally adopted on a voluntary basis throughout the country played an important part in conserving the limited supplies. A recent revision of Food Production Order No. 9 dealing with the sale and use of high protein meals became effective January 1, 1944. Under this order up to 20 percent of the supply of protein meals may be set aside for allocation by county and state A. A.A. committees and distributed through normal feed channels. This is an attempt to provide meals to small mixers and dealers. Protein meal allocations will be made to the various states by the Feed and Livestock branch of the Food Production Administration. The effect of this program remains to be seen. One thing is sure, however; it will not create any additional protein meals. It may help in distributing supplies we have.

Our feed grain picture has been little, if any, brighter than the protein problem. Generally speaking, we had good grain crops in 1943, although by no means as large as the bumper crops of 1942. Grain crops were down from 4 to 20 percent, depending upon the crop, under 1942 yields. In addition, hay production last summer was about 6 percent short of the previous year. The rate of feeding during the past year has been higher than usual.

Less Feed and More Animals

All of this adds up to the fact that at the beginning of the present feeding season we had about 12 to 15 percent less feed per animal unit than we had in 1942. All estimates of livestock numbers on January 1, 1944 show an increase of 10 to 12 percent over 1942 and from 25 to 28 percent higher than any other year. It appears necessary, therefore, that some adjustment take place in livestock numbers and rates of feeding to the smaller volume of feeds available.

If we attempt to maintain livestock production, especially milk and eggs, in the northeastern states, it is estimated by the Northeastern Governors' Feed Committee that during the present feeding season nearly 12,000,000 tons of feed concentrates will be required. This tonnage consists of some 3,000,000 tons of high-protein and commercial by-product feeds and 9,000,000 tons of corn, oats, and other feed grains.

Somewhat less than one-half of these feed grains is produced on farms in the region. Therefore, inshipments of grains required for the feeding year amount to almost 5,000,000 tons. For the current winter feeding season this amounts to approximately 18 million bushels of feed grains per month.

The job of maintaing such a flow of feed to our farms presents two important problems: (1) prying the grain loose at the sources of supply and (2) transportation.

Another and perhaps more serious problem has been the inability to buy corn and other grains in the corn belt because of ceiling prices. Because little corn was moving through feed channels the ceiling price on corn was raised 9 cents early in December. Prices were frozen on oats and barley and supplies of these feeds have dried up. Practically no corn moved during the latter part of December, but it was believed by some that it would move after January 1. There are indications now of some corn movements into this area. This may continue in appreciable amounts for one or two months. It is difficult to move large amounts of corn east for feeding from the surplus corn states because of the feed requirements of industrial users of corn. It will probably take a much more unfavorable corn-hog ratio than we now have to jar corn loose in significant quantities.

Canada Wheat

The only other source of supply of feed is wheat in the western provinces of Canada. While some of this wheat is now moving through Minneapolis, most of it is going into the southwest, south and southeast. None of it is coming east. The Director of Transportation of the War Food Administration recently gave us a very pessimistic picture of possibilities of wheat being transported from Canada to the northeast by rail in any appreciable amounts. Likewise, he very frankly and emphatically told us there were no possibilities for transportation of grains from South America because of lack of shipping space.

Such a situation calls for maximum cooperation on the part of every farmer and feeder in this country to see that our feeds are used as efficiently as possible. This is no time to waste scarce feed on inefficient animals. The national poultry culling program calling for elimination of ten percent of laying flocks in January is a definite step toward bringing our livestock population into balance with feed supplies. In many cases, we need to cull our dairy and other livestock herds more closely. Hogs must be slaughtered at a more rapid rate, especially those at the heavier weights. We are now getting some indications of lower feeding rates because of higher feed prices.

Looking ahead a little bit, every farmer can help solve his own feed problem. With the exception of poultry, the feed shortages can, to a

large extent, be met by improvement of pastures and by growing more and placing greater dependence on better quality hay and forage. Improvement of pasture and hay crops offers the safest bet for an adequate feed supply in 1944.

The farmers and feeders of this country have done a magnificent production job in spite of many difficulties. In like manner, feed mixers and feed dealers have done a very commendable job in spite of problems of price control, priorities, supplies, transportation, manpower and much red tape. In spite of all these handicaps, both groups will continue their splendid service in food production.

FEED DISTRIBUTION PROBLEMS

C. D. CASKEY, Director of Research, Southern States Cooperative
Baltimore, Md.

Mr. Caskey gave a very interesting discussion on Feed Distribution Problems of today. He explained the many rulings which help to determine where the feed is to be sold. The lack of transportation facilities today add greatly to the problem of distribution.

COMPARATIVE VALUE OF SUBSTITUTE FEEDS FOR LIVESTOCK

DR. DEVOE MEADE, Acting Head of Department of Animal Husbandry,
University of Maryland

The critical situation in which livestock producers today find themselves in relation to the available supply of feed for their livestock is due, not to a reduction in the normal amount of feed available, but rather; first, to the tremendous increase in total number of livestock in the country; second, to the demand upon our common carriers—railroads, trucks, ships, etc.—for transportation of troops and materials of war; and, third, to the effect which governmental price-fixing has had in disrupting the normal, equitable distribution of feed materials in the usual channels of trade.

Owing to the fact that it is now very difficult to secure needed supplies of any kind of feed, it seems somewhat inappropriate to discuss the Comparative Value of Substitute Feeds For Livestock at this time. However, because of the present tense feed situation it is now exceedingly essential that Maryland farmers feed more carefully and more efficiently than in normal years.

The two most important factors determining comparative value of available feeding stuffs are; first, the composition and characteristic qualities of the feed materials, both roughages and concentrates, now available; and, second, the type of animal to which the feed is to be fed and the particular purpose for which the animal is fed. Among the roughages, the legumes as a class are considerably higher in protein,

much higher in calcium, and also somewhat higher in phosphorous than are the non-legumes.

The cereal grains as a class are low in protein, deficient in the quality of their protein, exceedingly low in calcium, and not very high in phosphorus.

TABLE 2

COMMON FEEDS AND THEIR SUBSTITUTES

Common Feed	Feeds that may be substituted, the quantity to be substituted depending upon their relative feeding value.
Corn	Barley, kafir, milo, sorghum, oats, buckweat, rice or similar feeds rich in carbohydrates and fat.
Oats	Wheat bran, middlings, dried distillers grains, brewers grains, or feeds having similar physical and nutritive qualities.
Wheat bran	Ground oats, other bran, dried distillers grains, brewers grains, middlings, alfalfa meal, or feeds having similar physical or nutritive values.
Linseed meal	Cottonseed meal, peanut meal, soybean meal, gluten meal, gluten feed, or other feeds high in protein and mineral matter.
Cottonseed meal	Linseed meal, peanut meal, soybean meal, gluten meal, gluten feed, and others high in protein and mineral.
Tankage	Fishmeal, shrimp meal, meat scrap, and others very high in protein and mineral.
Corn silage	Grass silage, sorghum silage, pasture, roots, green forage crops, beet pulp (wet).
Pasture	Silage of various kinds, roots, green forage crops.
Clover hay	Other legumes such a alfalfa, soybean, lespedeza, cowpea.
Timothy hay	Other grass hays, mixed hays, cereal hays, oat straw, corn fooder.
Corn stover	Grass hays, oat straw, other stovers.
Oat straw	Corn stover, other stovers, other straws, cottonseed hulls, oat hulls.

Some by-product feeds, for example hominy, are low in protein. Gluten feed and others are medium in protein, while the oil meals as a class are high in protein. Tankage and fishmeal, both animal by-product feeds, are very high in protein.

With the exception of tankage and fishmeal, the legume roughages are the richest sources of calcium. Tankage and fishmeal are the best sources of phosphorous, followed by wheat bran, cottonseed meal, linseed meal, and soybean oil meal.

These roughages and concentrates vary considerably in the amounts of digestible protein, total digestible nutrients, and minerals which they contain. In considering the substitutional and supplemental value of feed materials in the compounding of rations it is necessary to keep in mind all of these factors.

Based upon their composition and also upon the fact that they possess somewhat similar qualities, there are listed in Table 2 some of our more common feeds, together with other feeds, which, in part at least, may be substituted for them. It should be borne in mind that some feeds, such as wheat and corn may entirely replace one another, whereas others, because of their nature or unpalatability, rye for example, should be utilized only as a partial substitution.

Table 3 gives the comparative substitutional value of some of the feeds listed in Table 2.

TABLE 3

COMPARATIVE FEEDING VALUE OF COMMON FEED MATERIALS

Grains & Medium to Low Protein Feeds	Comparative value No. 2 Corn—100	High protein feeds	Comparative value Cottonseed meal 100
Corn No. 2	100	Cottonseed meal	100
Oats	88	Gluten meal	97
Barley	94	Gluten feed	76
Rye	85	Linseed meal	91
Wheat middlings	104	Soybean oil meal	103
Kafir	95	Soybeans	100
Milo	95	Tankage—Meat scrap	152
Wheat bran	90	Fishmeal	152
Wheat midlings	104	Skim milk, dried	121
Alfalfa meal	70	Peanut oil meal	103
Hominy feed	100	Dried brewer's grains	66
Oat mill feed	50		
Molasses	72		
Beet pulp, dried	91		

Hay and other roughage	Comparative Value Alfalfa Hay 100
Alfalfa	100
Red clover	100
Clover and timothy	82
Lespedeza	100
Soybeans	92
Timothy	80
Millet	82
Sudan grass	77
Oat hay	80
Corn fodder	77
Corn stover	52
Oat straw	45
Wheat straw	22
Soybean straw	30
Cottonseed hulls	57
Corn silage	33

No statement can be made that will indicate the exact substitutional value of one feed for another, since this value may vary considerably with a number of factors. For example, ruminants as a class make better use of roughages and higher fiber feeds than do non-ruminants, some feeds have relatively higher values for animals on maintenance than for productive purposes, and also the quality of feeds vary considerably as a result of different conditions of production, processing, handling, etc. Nevertheless, the values shown in Table 3, based upon composition, upon evidence derived from practical experience and feeding trials are probably a fair statement of the comparative substitutional values of some of our more commonly used feeds. In this table the medium and low protein concentrates are compared with No. 2 corn, the high protein feeds with cottonseed meal, and the roughages with alfalfa hay.

Let us next consider the effect which the type of animal fed, the particular purpose for which the animal is fed and the roughage fed have upon the percentage of protein that should be contained in the concentrate portion of the ration and how much concentrate rations may be compounded easily.

In general, it may be said that lactating animals, young growing animals, and pregnant females require more protein than do other classes of livestock. The use of legume roughage and good pasture reduces the amount of protein which it is necessary to have in the concentrate mixture. Under present conditions, even with poor roughage,

concentrate mixtures should not carry over 18 percent total protein or 14 percent digestible protein for any class of livestock.

A very simple, quick, and accurate method of compounding a concentrate mixture of any desired percentage protein is as follows:

1. Draw a rectangle and place in the center of this rectangle the figure indicating the percentage of protein desired in the mixture.

2. Select two feeds (or mixtures), one with a protein content below and the other above that desired in the completed mixture.

3. Write the name of one feed and its content of protein at the upper left hand corner and the other similarly at the lower left hand corner.

4. Substract the percentage of protein in the lower protein feed (or mixture) from the percentage in the desired mixture and write the figure representing the difference in the diagonally opposite corner.

5. Substract the percentage of protein in the desired mixture from the percentage of protein contained in the higher protein feed (or mixture) placing the figure representing the difference in the diagonally opposite corner.

6. Read directly across the rectangle in a horizontal direction to obtain the respective proportionate amounts of each food (or mixture) which when combined will produce a mixture carrying the desired percentage of protein. Any multiple of these proportionate parts will, of course, when combined result in a mixture with the same percentage of protein.

Suppose then that one desires to compound a 16 percent protein mixture for a group of growing pigs weighing 100 to 150 pounds (See Table 4) and has available wheat with 13.1% of total protein and a hog supplement containing 34% of total protein. Then following the above procedure we have:

Wheat	13.1	18.0	pounds or proportionate parts of wheat
	16		
Hog supplement	34.0	2.9	pounds of proportionate parts of hog supplement

Then 18 pounds of wheat combined with 2.9 pounds of hog supplement or any multiple of those proportionate amounts, say 1,800 and 290 pounds, respectively, will produce a 16 percent mixture.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

Membership has increased from 247 in 1942 to 332 in 1943. This is a continuation of the trend for the past few years and it is the hope of

the officers of the association that this figure may reach 500 in 1944.

Eight editions of the News Letters were published in 1943. The first five were mimeographed. The last three issues of the News Letter are made possible through cooperation of the Maryland State Fair Board and special thanks should be given to John E. Clark, Field Representative, and to Gerald Lund, who assisted in designing the form used.

The Secretary wishes to thank all who have contributed to the success of the News Letter and to encourage all members to send in timely news items, and to take advantage of the "Wanted and For Sale" column.

The Board of Directors met December 7, at 22 Light Street, Baltimore, Maryland, and planned the Annual Meeting for January 12, 1944.

The Secretary has contributed timely articles to a monthly column entitled "Maryland Livestock News" published in the *Maryland Farmer* under the sponsorship of the Maryland Stockmen's Association.

The financial condition of the association is as good as it has been for some time, with a balance on hand as of January 11, 1944, of $277.39.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS ELECTED FOR 1944

President	Jos. W. Shirley, Jr.	Reisterstown
Vice-President	Vere S. Culver	Port Deposit
Secretary-Treasurer	James B. Outhouse	College Park
Asst. Secretary-Treasurer	Ural G. Bee	College Park
	Wells E. Hunt	Baltimore
	Guy E. Harmon	Queenstown
	S. J. Prigel	Glen Arm
	Wm. H. Cunningham	Fairplay
	B. S. Oles	Kingsville

Director to the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.—J. Herbert Snyder, Union Bridge

Delegate to the Annual Meeting of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.—John E. Muncaster, Derwood

Delegate to the Maryland Agricultural Society—J. Kieffer Funk, Hagerstown

Movies "A Nation's Meat" and "Soldiers of The Soil"

These two sound pictures were shown by the Secretary, Jas. B. Outhouse. The picture "A Nation's Meat" gives in detail the processes of producing, slaughtering, processing and delivering our nation's meat supplies. The packers have done a lot to educate the public by using moving pictures.

EVENING SESSION

MERCHANTS CLUB

REMARKS OF DAN E. WIGHT IN RECOMMENDING DR. MARK WELSH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF HONORARY LIFE MEMBERSHIP IN THE MARYLAND STOCKMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Dr. Mark Welsh left his position as State Veterinarian of Maryland September 15, 1943, to become Director of the Veterinary Division of the Lederle Laboratories, Inc., of Pearl River, New York. Behind him he left an outstanding record of 24 years' service and a host of friends who greatly appreciate what he did in directing the work of the Livestock Sanitary Service. Records will show that Maryland ranks among the top states in the union in the eradication of tuberculosis and Bang's disease among cattle. Likewise, many other diseases and parasites have been held in check by the good work of Dr. Welsh and his associates. Dr. Welsh has been a member of the Maryland Stockmen's Association for many years and has supported its activities. He has been a speaker on many of its programs and has always shown a very cooperative and sympathetic attitude toward Animal Husbandry problems throughout the state. To him many livestock producers owe a debt of gratitude for directing a program of disease and parasite control which has saved them many dollars.

We take this opportunity to wish him every sucess in his new position and I am proud to recommend him for Honorary Life Membership in the Maryland Stockmen's Association in recognition of outstanding services to the livestock industry of the State of Maryland.

REMARKS MADE BY DAN E. WIGHT IN RECOMMENDING W. R. HARVEY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF HONORARY LIFE MEMBERSHIP IN THE MARYLAND STOCKMEN'S ASSOCIATION

W. R. Harvey was born in Illinois and spent much of his early boyhood at Sibley Farms, where his father was manager. Here he became well acquainted with Animal Husbandry problems and his background has served him well in his connection with the livestock industry.

Mr. Harvey judged fat barrows at the first International Livestock Exposition in 1900 at Chicago, Ill., and has always been interested in the swine industry, having developed an outstanding herd of Chester White swine at his farm at Corbett, Maryland.

Since coming to Maryland, Mr. Harvey has played a very important part in the growth of the livestock industry. He was influential in the organization of the Beef Cattle Conference, the Maryland Sheep Growers' Association and the Maryland Swine Growers' Association; organizations that preceded the Maryland Stockmen's Association.

For years Mr. Harvey has been Superintendent of the beef cattle and swine departments at the Timonium State Fair. During this time exhibits in these departments have grown from a small number to proportions which mark them as among the largest at any of the eastern state fairs.

Probably most of us know him best as President and General Manager of the Baltimore Livestock Show. Here for the past 15 years Mr. Harvey has rendered a great service to all livestock producers in the eastern part of the United States. He has served on many committees and in many advisory capacities. He is President of the Maryland Swine Breeders' Association, a member of the Maryland State Fair Board, and a member of the Advisory Council of the Animal Husbandry Department of the University of Maryland.

Mr. Harvey has always taken an active part in the Maryland Stockmen's Association and was one of the leaders in its organization in 1929. He served as its first president in 1930 and 1931.

These are some of the accomplishments of Mr. Harvey and alone justify this recognition of him, but even more important is his character. I believe Mr. Harvey is loved by all of us here and that we admire him and feel that he exemplifies high integrity in our livestock business.

It is with great pride that I recommend Mr. W. R. Harvey for Honorary Life Membership in the Maryland Stockmen's Association for outstanding character and service to the livestock industry of the State of Maryland.

POST-WAR PROBLEMS

SENATOR MILLARD E. TYDINGS

We are in the middle of the greatest war in history. We are winning that war. A completely victorious outcome is only a matter of time. Your organization, like its counterparts in other parts of the country, will spare neither treasure nor effort nor life itself to hasten the days of a victorious peace.

It is a dull man indeed, however, in the midst of these tragic hours, who does not at once comprehend that in the field of municipal, local and national government, so great is the strain of war that things must not be taken for granted. A policy of drift will be ruinous. A civic aloofness, at the very moment of victory, in the economic and political repercussions of the war will take from our nation and people, who have sacrificed so much, the things they have been fighting to maintain. In such circumstances, we should be little better off in victory than we would be in defeat.

When we contemplate that at the end of this war the national debt will be around three hundred billion dollars, which is a first mortgage

of nearly ten thousand dollars on the homes of every family, rich and poor, black and white, high and low, in this land, we come to know instantly what must be established during the continuance of this war and after as the last best hope for a continuance of our political institutions, our high standard of living and the scores of freedoms which are ours traditionally. Here on the home front public economy is patriotism. Public economy is second only to the war effort in keeping our institutions strong and healthy, or, to state it in simpler terms, to safeguard the opportunity which gives to the everyday man in this country the best chance for himself, his family and his neighbors.

Conversely, extravagance, waste and inefficiency of administration which breeds waste, is to sabotage the American standard of living, breed unemployment, deter free business enterprise, and make a farce of the immeasurable sacrifices which our dead have contributed in Africa, Europe and the Southwest Pacific. Governmental extravagance and inefficiency means that our returning wounded and well soldiers, after their years of facing the hazards and hardships of the battlefield, will join a new army of street corner apple sellers, relief clients, with the loss of homes and farms, and tragic want. No matter how many liberty bonds one buys, how many wartime agencies one joins and assists, how many planes or tanks or guns one turns out, how rigorously one adheres to all wartime restrictions, if he is oblivious to the unnecessary expenditure of public money, whether it be local, city, or national, he has missed the true meaning of patriotism if he does not join in keeping all unnecessary enlargement of the public debt from occurring and is not as enthusiastic a worker in the ranks of those who fight for all possible economy in government and for the ending of all inefficient administration therein.

How can we avoid this? It seems to me the program is simple, whether it be city, state, or national government, every possible non-war expenditure must be either cut to the bone or eliminated. That is the only way, in the face of tremendous appropriations, that any economy and any lightening of the future burden can be accomplished.

Second, while appropriating for war purposes, every single dollar that is needed, to follow those appropriations through and see that they are expended for the purposes for which they are made; that the cancer of extravagance, that overlapping, duplication and poor administration be cut out of them wherever it is detected.

And what does the post-war period hold in prospect for us? Why is it abundantly and overwhelmingly necessary to cut and cut and cut down every non-essential expenditure that we possibly can? Let us take a brief look at the post-war picture. Well, first, I have mentioned a possible 300 billion dollar national debt, which means a first mortgage on nearly every farm and home in America of ten thousand dollars.

That is only the national debt. There are still the city and county and local debts and the corporate and the personal debts, too. Second, there are ten million men in the armed forces. Eight million of these must be brought home. They must hunt for jobs at the very time when all are turning from war production to peace production. This cannot be done in a minute. These men are entitled to our first consideration. There will be eight million of them looking for work.

Then there are twenty million men and women in the war plants. Most of these plants will close down over night when the last shot is fired. They are not making the things we need in peacetime. They are producing for war. It will take time to re-tool and re-arrange and start up some of these plants for peacetime production. Some will be permanently closed. Thus, to the eight million returning soldiers, we must add a potential civilian army of unemployed of from ten to fifteen million men, making in the neighborhood of twenty million milling around in the immediate post-war period, as war production stops and peace production gets slowly under way.

Third, then the government already has sixty billion dollars' worth of war materials hanging over the post-war market. Millions of shoes, millions of cases of food, great stores of clothing, lumber, cement, trucks and the like. For most of this vast quantity of goods there will be no further need. The government will want to dispose of it. Thus, the government will be selling in the post-war period the very things that industry will want to be manufacturing. There is a tremendous threat to employment in this condition, which can only be averted if these huge supplies are disposed of in an orderly, comprehending way so as to give the least competition to private business and so as not to destroy jobs in private plants producing these same articles.

This world will be a different world after this war is over. There are millions of starving, ragged and emaciated people strung all over the earth. Their credit is gone. Their political institutions have been demolished. It will be a long while before trade with these nations can be restored, for they have neither credit nor the goods which they might exchange for ours. And I might go on and portray other events in the post-war period, but these, it seems to me, are sufficient to halt in his very tracks the advocate of extravagance, to cause even the thoughtless to pause and reflect, indeed to impel him eventually to join the great army of Americans who are anticipating the future and who are demanding every economy possible in these tragic days, so that the post-war period shall contain as few hardships as possible; so that we shall not lose our system of free enterprise, our free political institutions, our guaranteed personal freedom, so that war regimentation, bureaucracy and control will not have to be projected into the period following the war.

Yes, my friends, economy is patriotism. Only by embracing wholeheartedly the cause of economy can we keep faith with John Smith from

Chicago who died on Guadalcanal, with Beech Clark of Havre de Grace, Maryland, who lost his legs and bore numerous wounds flying over New Guinea, with the brothers and sisters of John Jones, who came out of Salerno a mental wreck and a ward for his government for the rest of his life, and with Bill Brown who luckily escaped it all and who wants to plunge into something like the normal American life he knew so that he, by his efforts and integrity, may climb the rungs of the ladder of success for himself and his family.

These reflections cause me to wonder how during this war in our National Legislature there could be men who would fight for a continuance of the C.C.C., of the N.Y.A., of the W.P.A., and of the other agencies I have named causing an extra billion and a half dollars a year of borrowed money to be spent, for the relatives of our war dead and the wounded and well returning from the battlefields, who must pay for this war-time extravagance.

Just as there were thoughtless persons who did not heed the coming avalanche of 1929, which robbed millions of homes, of the light of prosperity and happiness, when the great depression spread its darkening blanket over the nation, so the thoughtless of today are not only not keeping faith with those who are making the supreme sacrifice, suffering wounds and bravely facing the hazards of the battlefront, but they are destroying the future prosperity and opportunities of all those who remain behind in the post-war period.

What does this observation hold for all of us? It seems to me to hold, and hold very clearly, the fact that we must more and more and more watch and fight unnecessary expenditures in our national government than ever before in our history. Heretofore, we have focused our primary attention on things municipal and state. We must continue to do that to a large degree, but as I have shown, the shadow of depression in the post-war years now comes from the national government and it is to that front that we must send our best and tried troops.

Every duplication of effort, all overlapping activities, all maladministration must be hunted down relentlessly, and exterminated. We cannot go about this task half-heartedly. There should be, can be and must be a unity second to none on this front. This is one place we can fight with somewhat of a kindred valor as is exhibited by those in the armed forces.

Ever since 1929 we have been living on the future. We have not been paying our way, we have been meeting a large part of our national government's expenses by borrowing upon it. The interest must be met by high taxes for many, many years to come. There was a lethargy then in our people. Washington was too far off. Only a few were energetic enough to write to their Congressmen or to pass resolutions calling for correction. Too, many were too occupied in getting to realize that they

themselves must return what they had gotten through long and heavy taxes. From 1929 to 1940 in peacetime, your national government spent twenty-seven billion dollars more than it took in. For a period during the dark days of the depression this policy was justifiable. The economic life of the nation lay prostrate. But as we began to emerge from the depression, in '35 and '36, we should have then and there as, I may say I repeatedly advocated, gone on a pay-as-you-go basis. Now, we have to bear in addition to all the war debts and taxes at times when we will be less able to do it, the extra burden of taxation caused by our lack of diligence from 1936 to 1940.

And do not think in that ten-year period this deficit amounting to about two billion, seven hundred million dollars a year was occasioned by large expenditures for national defense. During that ten-year period the entire cost of our Army and Navy averaged but one billion, one hundred million dollars a year. Thus, if we subtract this one billion, one hundred million dollars yearly cost of our Army and Navy from the two billion, seven hundred million dollars yearly deficit during this ten-year period, we find that we spent one billion, six hundred million dollars a year, without a penny of it going for the Army and Navy during each of the ten years from 1929 to 1940. It is as plain as the nose on one's face. This care-free policy must be a part of the events of yesterday if this nation wants to survive. There must be no more of this easy-going finance. When peace finally comes again, we must find the means, even if it has to be by constitutional amendment, which in times of peace will prevent future Congresses from appropriating more than they take in unless they provide at the same time other revenue which, over a period of fifteen or twenty years immediately following, will fully discharge any deficit which any Congress creates.

Many states do that already. The Constitution of the State of Maryland carries a provision that the Legislature can appropriate no money that it does not have in hand unless it provides the revenues at the same time to pay off any deficit so created within a period of fifteen years.

Human nature is so constructed that unless the responsibility of obtaining goes with the privilege of appropriating money, deficits are almost inevitable. Pressure groups contend for this and that appropriation, and often get it, and then return to oppose the very taxes which are necessary to pay for the appropriation they desire. Too many people have been following the philosophy of large appropriations and no taxes. Such a policy eventually means no appropriations, all taxes and unemployment, loss of homes and distress.

I am hopeful we can find a way to compel Congress, and thereby the pressure groups, to find the means of paying for what they want.

REPORT

OF THE

ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

Maryland Tobacco Growers' Association

January 12, 1944

A very large attendance was present at the Annual Meeting of the Maryland Tobacco Growers' Association, held on Wednesday, January 12, 1944, at the Lord Baltimore Hotel.

The meeting was opened by C. C. Lee, President, who stated that the Association's expansion program is being retarded by the war, but that the post-war era would see the Associaton rendering more service over a larger territory than at any time in its history. He called attention to the large patronage dividends distributed on the 1943 business, amounting to approximately $50,000, which in private business would have gone into the hands of independent operators. Such dividends are a tribute to the cooperation of the farmers of Southern Maryland.

Dr. F. B. Bomberger, Coordinator of Marketing in Maryland, gave a talk on "United We Stand". He stated that these are times when the Nations must stand united for their own preservation, and the farmers must unite so they can deal and make known their needs collectively, which cannot be done individually. Other groups are accomplishing excellent results by organizing themselves, and farmers can accomplish comparable results.

George Sachse, General Manager of the Maryland Tobacco Growers' Association, called the farmers' attention to the fact that replacement supplies for farms are not available, and part of the cash left over after general expenses represented depletion of the farm. The value of such depletion should be placed in war bonds and used after the war to rebuild the farm to its former condition and productivity. He stated that subsidies would create rather than prevent inflation; as they would

increase purchasing power. He said also that it would be unfair for a returning soldier to pay part of the grocery bill of civilians who are receiving the highest wages in history. Mr. Sachse then explained the association's operating statement and balance sheet and presented charts to show the improvement in the Association's operations and financial standing.

George I. Gardiner, Salesman of the Maryland Tobacco Growers' Association, gave statistics showing that the average price for which the Association sold tobacco in 1943 was far ahead of the loose leaf market. He pointed out also that the Association sold tobacco for 70¢ a pound against a legitimtae top of 61¢ on the loose leaf market. The difference in selling price plus the difference in commission between the two marketing systems made a heavy balance in favor of the Baltimore market. He told the farmers that they would have to support their Association more strongly in the future if they expected to benefit by its activities.

Mr. McCue, purchasing Agent of the Association, explained the shortage of certain supplies, but called attention to the fact that due to the large volume of farmer supplies distributed the Association was in a better position to secure hard-to-get items than the average store in Southern Maryland, and that the stronger people supported their Association, the better position it would be in to continue to serve them.

Tenth Annual Winter Meeting
of the
Maryland State Poultry Council
Baltimore, Maryland - January 12, 1944

President Harry H. Rieck opened the meeting and after a few remarks appointed the following committees:

Resolutions: Mrs. W. W. Hopkins, Dr. M. A. Jull
Auditing: R. C. Morris, Charles E. Ritter
Credentials: Wm. Ratcliff, Mrs. A. W. Sattler, W. H. Rice
Nominating: A. D. Couden, Charles E. Ritter, Wm. Ratcliff

The President pointed out that conditions arising from the war in 1944 would continue to create problems for the industry in reference to feed, fuel and other supplies, ceiling prices and restrictive orders. The industry had weathered these storms in 1943, he said, and expressed the belief that it would continue to meet and overcome these problems in 1944, even though outlook for profits are much less bright than during the past two years. In lieu of a lengthy address, the President requested the Secretary to read a brief report of the Executive Committee which follows:

"The executive Committee has functioned independently of the directors during 1943 only to effectuate the policies laid down by the directors at their three meetings of January 10th, July 8th, and November 2. Legislation and Fresh Egg Program work are reported on by committees and will not be discussed here. These topics were the principal subjects considered at the meeting of the directors on January 10.

The Directors on July 8th met in response to request for cooperation with the Food Distribution Administration and Office of Price Administration in effectuating the program of grading, price control, and control of black markets in poultry products in Maryland.

The question of Federal Grades, especially on eggs, and their application to all eggs sold as well as price ceilings were matters of considerable discussion at the meeting. Since several of the provisions of this program conflicted somewhat with our own Fresh Egg Program, and in view of the limited personnel available to carry out a program of

grading schools, inspection and other features proposed, the Council endorsed the program in principle with certain reservations, but pledged full cooperation in the control of black markets and fraudulent dealings in the industry with the assurance of full cooperation of the F.D.A. and O.P.A. in correcting inequities and injustices in the industry.

Due to labor shortages, and travel restrictions, the regular summer meeting of the Council was not held in 1943 and the Conference on July 8 which considered the Feed and Coal problems, and the F.D.A. and O.P.A. programs served that purpose.

Neppco Meeting 1943: About 50 Maryland poultrymen attended the War-time Problem Meeting of NEPPCO in New York on August 25-27. The problems considered here were of regional and national scope, and dealt principally with feed, fuel, equipment and other supplies, and production goals, restrictive orders, price control and similar problems.

Directors Meeting, November 2, 1943: Matters considered by the directors on November 2 covered feed and coal, supplies, food subsidies, turkey ceiling prices and corn ceiling prices. Various eastern organizations have endeavored during 1943 to secure increased ceiling prices for corn. The price was raised from $1.07 to $1.17, but this is insufficient to secure release of Western corn stocks for eastern markets so long as hog prices remain at present levels, since it is more profitable to feed corn to hogs than to sell at $1.17 per bushel.

Outlook for 1944: The outlook in 1944 for Maryland poultrymen is by no means as bright as in 1943. Increased difficulties in securing feeds of even lower quality are in prospect. Some equipment may be available in larger quantities than in 1943. Labor will become even shorter, through drafting of men for military service, and maintenance and repairs will be neglected."

THE OUTLOOK FOR POULTRYMEN IN 1944 REGARDING FEED, FUEL CEILING PRICES, EQUIPMENT, ETC.

H. L. SHRADER, Senior Extension Poultry Husbandman,
U. S. Department of Agriculture

Briefly, the poultry situation in as follows: In 1944 we must maintain essential production of poultry meat and eggs with a less abundant feed supply. The number of potential layers on hand December 1, 1943, was 9 percent larger than a year ago. Even if some of those birds are culled-out, we still can reach the egg production goal of 102 percent of last year's crop. Our suggestion has been that the numbers of layers be reduced to about the 1943 level.

Poultrymen Urged to Cull Laying Flocks Closely. Efficiency in use of feed for producing eggs increases as the average number of eggs produced per bird increases. In view of this consideration and the 1944

egg goal, which is 2 percent above 1943 production, it appears desirable that numbers of layers be reduced somewhat from the present record high level. On December 8, through a statement issued jointly by the War Food Administration and representatives of the poultry industry, poultrymen were urged to cull flocks closely in coming weeks. It was suggested that poultrymen cull birds not in laying condition, especially older birds and undersized, slow-maturing pullets.

Our feed supply in 1944 will be such that it will be necessary to balance livestock and poultry production with feed production. The production goals for next year have been based substantially on the available feed supply and it is becoming more and more apparent that we cannot exceed any of our goals. Sufficient feed should be available to meet the the goals set, but in order that every chick hatched may be fed, we must not exceed our livestock goals, including those for eggs and poultry meat.

In this connection, I should like to point out that our poultry goals have heretofore been exceeded and the outlook for 1944 indicates that we may easily do this again.

A three-point program has been developed in cooperation with various agencies which deal with poultry in the War Food Administration. This program consists of: (1) Securing commitments from various agencies for 200 million pounds of poultry during the month of January; (2) culling 50 million extra hens between December 15 and February 1; and (3) reducing the number of baby chicks hatched in 1944, 16 percent for broilers, and 4 percent for replacement.

Speaking of feed—poultry is now the second largest consumer of feed grains and concentrates. Here are some recent figures showing the amount of feed consumed by classes of livestock. The animal unit numbers are based on the 1944 goal figures—hogs, 57 million tons; poultry, 28.5 million tons; dairy cattle, 21 million tons; beef cattle, 21 million tons; horses and mules, 9.6 million tons; sheep, lambs, and others, 4.1 million tons. This adds up to the total feed available in 1944, with reasonable allowances for carry-over, of 140.7 million tons. The break-down for poultry is as follows: Laying flocks, 17.6 million tons; chicks raised for replacement, 8.8 million tons; broilers, 1.1 million tons; and turkeys, 1.0 million tons.

Suggested Production Goals for 1944 with Comparisons

	1937-41 Ave.	Indicated 1943	Suggested 1944	% Suggested 1944 is of 1943
Eggs, doz.[2]	3,577	4,516	4,597	102
Hens and pullets (Jan. 1)[1]	376,576	487,089	540,812	111
Chickens raised on farms[1]	656,464	925,652	892,983	96
Commercial broilers raised[1]	110,927	248,576	208,805	84
Turkeys raised[1]	30,723	33,176	32,079	97
Chickens (Incl. broilers) (dressed weight), Lbs.[2]	2,400	4,000	4,000	100
Chicks[2]		1,450	1,305	90
Milk cows, No. on farms[1]		25,669	26,148	102
Hogs, No. of sows to farrow:				
In spring[1]		12,140	10,325	85
In fall[1]		8,515	6,898	81
Cattle and calves, Total No., Dec. 31[1]		80,800	76,840	95
Beef cows, Dec. 31[2]		12,406	11,970	96
Sheep and Lambs, No. on Farms, Dec. 31[1]		52,900	51,901	98

[1] 000 omitted. [2] 000,000 omitted

A Poultry Industry-Government Joint Program for Maintaining '44 Poultry and Egg Production

Greatly increased production of poultry and eggs in the past three years is direct evidence of the whole-hearted cooperation of the nation's poultry industry in the war effort. The industry has met and exceeded wartime goals each year. It has established new all-time records in production, despite many handicaps.

At the beginning of the war the problem of producing meat, milk and eggs was to obtain the greatest production to meet current requirements and to prepare for emergency needs. Today we have the same problem of providing enough food. There is, however, this difference—in 1944 we must maintain essential production of poultry meat and eggs with a less abundant feed supply.

By making more feed available to the high-producing birds and providing less crowded conditions for them, it will be possible to increase egg production per bird and maintain a higher standard of health and vitality, as recommended in the Poultry Conservation for Victory program.

The War Food Administration and all segments of the poultry industry join in this urgent request that poultrymen throughout the

country devote the month of January to the job of putting their flocks on the most efficient basis possible, so that our production goals may be realized. By culling flocks back to January, 1943, numbers and employing the best possible feeding and management methods with the higher-producing birds, we sincerely believe this job can be done.

This program was drawn up and actively supported by:

War Food Administration
International Baby Chick Association
National Poultry Defense Committee
Feed Industry Council
National Poultry Advisory Council
Northeastern Poultry Producers' Council
December 8, 1943

Cull frequently and market immediately to conserve feed and poultry meat, to lower rate of mortality, and to improve egg production per bird. When birds are in heavy production, cull at night with the aid of a flash light, to remove unprofitable individuals.

Occasionally it may be advisable to catch the whole flock, using a portable wire enclosure, or catching crate, so that each bird may be examined.

IMPROVING MARYLAND TURKEY BREEDING FLOCKS THROUGH THE MARYLAND TURKEY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

by

FRANK E. MOORE, Poultry Coordinator, U. S. Department of Agriculture

Objectives of the Turkey Improvement Program are to improve the production and market qualities of turkeys; to reduce losses from pullorum disease; to provide for authoritative identification of turkey breeding stock hatching eggs, and poults with respect to breeding quality and degree of freedom from pullorum disease; and to cause turkey production to be more efficient and aid in making the enterprise more profitable.

The program is administered in each participating state by an official state agency cooperating with the Bureau of Animal Industry, Agricultural Research Administration, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture.

Three Progressive Breeding Stages

Specific Requirements:

(1) All breeding birds are carefully selected and officially banded annually by trained and authorized selecting agents or state inspectors.

(2) The method of selecting turkey breeding stock for standard-bred and meat production qualities prescribed by the state college of agriculture or other properly constituted state agency will be used as the basis for selection.

(3) Only birds with sealed and numbered official bands are allowed in the breeding flocks.

(4) Care is exercised in maintaining purity of breeding in all breeding flocks and identity of hatching eggs and poults.

I. U. S. Approved: A flock mating for the mass production of hatching eggs and poults. Improvement is largely based on physical selection. This breeding stage is primarily a multiplication stage and the physical selection is to endeavor to preserve and improve the quality of the breeding birds.

II. U. S. Certified: Improvement is based on physical selection combined with the use of pedigreed toms. This breeding stage includes flock matings for mass production of hatching eggs and poults and single-tom pen matings to provide for U.S.R.O.M. candidates. All hens to be used as breeders must be selected, inspected, and approved as for U. S. Approved and, in addition, must be free from disqualifications. After the second year of U. S. Certified breeding work on any farm, hens to be used as breeders are required to be from U. S. Certified or U.S.R.O.M. matings.

All toms in U. S. Certified breeding flocks must be sons of U.S.R.O.M. matings. They also must be excellent representatives of the variety, indicate strong vigor and have excellent body conformation and fleshing condition at time of inspection. Inspection may not be made before the toms are 24 weeks old. Their wing—and leg-bands shall show the type of U.S.R.O.M. mating that they are from. To make it possible for a breeder to get started in U. S. Certified breeding work within his own strain, U. S. Approved toms of outstanding quality may be used in single-tom pen matings during the first two years on his farm. In such cases, hatching eggs and poults from their matings may be sold only as U. S. Approved.

III. U.S.R.O.M. (Register of Merit): This breeding stage embraces individual and family records of egg production, fertility, viability and market quality of the progeny.

U.S.R.O.M. candidate matings are referred to as U. S. Certified single-tom pen matings until the requirements shown below are met by either the tom heading the pen or one or more of the hens in the pen after which the progeny from the qualified birds may be recognized as being from a U.S.R.O.M. mating.

U.S.R.O.M. Tom: He must have physical qualities similar to those of toms heading U. S. Certified flocks and must have been used in a

U. S. Certified single-tom mating (either trap-nest or non-trap-nest) and met the following requirements: (1) A hatch of 65 percent or more of all eggs set from the pen. An average of at least 20 eggs per female in the pen and a minimum of 200 eggs from the pen shall be set. (2) At least 85 percent of all poults started and a minimum of 100 turkeys from the pen must be reared to market age. (3) 60 percent of all young-tom progeny and 80 percent of all young-hen progeny from the pen shall be equivalent to U. S. Grade-A by 26 weeks of age, except at that age they need not necessarily be well fattened nor practically free of pinfeathers.

Having thus qualified, the tom may be banded with an official sealed leg-band carrying the letters "U.S.R.O.M." and his sons, provided they pass inspection, are automatically eligible to head U. S. Certified matings the following breeding season.

U.S.R.O.M. Hen: She must on initial inspection indicate strong vigor, excellent body conformation and fleshing condition, must be an excellent representative of the variety, must have been trapnested under official supervision 13 consecutive weeks, and must meet the requirements of (a) or (b) below:

(a) Produce eggs at the rate of 50 percent for 13 consecutive weeks after the first egg is laid in a trapnest, hatch 70 percent of all eggs set, produce a minimum of 25 good poults, and have a minimum of 20 poults alive at market age. The market quality requirements of her progeny shall be the same as that for the progeny of a U.S.R.O.M. tom.

(b) Produce at the rate of 2¼ poults per week for 13 consecutive weeks, a minimum of 20 of which are alive at market age and the market quality of which are the same as that required for the progeny of a U.S.R.O.M. tom.

Three Progressive Pullorum Classes

1. The aim or goal is eradication rather than mere control of the disease in turkeys.
2. The official test is the standard tube agglutination test.
3. Participation in a pullorum class is a prerequisite for participation in the breeding stage, except where facilities for tube testing are not available.
4. All breeding birds are tested and officially banded under supervision.
5. All hatcheries and breeding flocks are inspected annually.
6. Complete segregation of turkeys from Chickens on the farm and in hatcheries at all stages of development and during all seasons of the year is urgently recommended.

7. Custom hatching of eggs from non-officially tested sources is not permitted in same room with officially tested eggs.

8. Birds must be more than 4 months old before being tested.

EGG PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

by

H. C. KNANDEL, Head Poultry Dept., Pennsylvania State College

There are many problems facing the egg producer in the year 1944. There is, however, a solution I believe for many of these problems. Let us look at the major hurdles which the poultry producer must overcome during the next 12 months.

A. The Problem

I. *Feed supply*—Authoritative reports indicate that the feed supply for 1944 will not be appreciably greater than that which was available in 1943. With the reduction of livestock units, which is now taking place especially in the case of hogs and to some extent beef cattle and poultry, more feed will be available for the livestock which remains. There will still be a scarcity of many of the important ingredients needed to feed chickens. The supply of fishmeal will be greatly reduced, due to strikes and poor fishing conditions. Meat scraps may be slightly increased in volume. There seems to be no likelihood of great increases, in the east at least, of soybean oil meal, dried milk products and bonemeal. The quality and quantity of alfalfa meal will be less than that of 1943. In the past few months, it has been difficult to obtain sufficient corn. Due to the liquidation of livestock, principally hogs, more corn is now seen in the eastern markets. More and more the east must depend upon such homegrown grains as oats, barley and to some extent wheat and corn. There seems to be no particular shortage of vitamin A and D concentrates and probably the best substitute for the vitamin G concentrates, which in some cases are difficult to obtain, will be to use good pastures.

II. *Labor shortage.* An efficient poultryman will so manage his labor that the men will not work harder, but they will work to better advantage. In other words, he will plan his work and then work his plan. The use of labor-saving devices, such as automatic waterers on range, will do much to conserve labor. It will be necessary on large commercial farms to use employees who are unaccustomed to poultry work. These may be women, veterans of the war, or young high school students. It will take patience to work with these people in order that they may learn the fundamentals so necessary in the care of poultry.

III. *Equipment Shortage*—There will be a shortage of metal equipment as there has been in the past. Brooder stoves, hoppers, fountains, etc.,

will be difficult to obtain in the quantities needed. It may be difficult to build new buildings because of priorities.

IV. *Transportation*—The transportation problem is a serious one affecting the poultry industry, both from the standpoint of bringing feed into the area and marketing poultry products within a district.

V. *Mortality* in laying flocks may be greater this year for these reasons:

(a) Overcrowding of layers.

(b) Lack of attention to approved methods of raising pullets.

(c) Insufficient culling of pullets at housing time and throughout the year.

(d) Lack of attention to approved methods of disease prevention, such as reasonable sanitation, vaccination of pullets for chicken pox and laryngotrachetis in communities where these diseases are serious problems.

(e) Failure of the owner to dispose of old stock before housing the pullets, which practice may have resulted in the spread of such serious diseases as paralysis cholera and typhoid.

(f) Nutritional troubles due to shortage of ingredients in vitamin values.

B. The Solution

I. Keep poultry that can use feed most efficiently.

(a) With heavy breeds, maintain a laying flock of 100 percent pullets.

(b) Hold only the best yearling hens of the light breeds for egg production.

(c) Market surplus cockerels as broilers.

II. (a) Since no single grain supply will be constant, it will be necessary for poultrymen to use, during certain periods, perhaps wheat and barley in place of corn and at other time corn and oats in place of wheat or barley. In other words, we must build our rations so that any of the grains can be interchanged and at the same time not upset production. Do not blame the feed manufacturer because each lot of feed that you purchase does not look the same. The feed manufacturer is undoubtedly doing the best he can to supply you with the best ingredients, but he, too, is limited as to what he can purchase and so does the best he can with what he has.

(b) This year, more than ever before, a good range was highly desirable. Not only will a luxuriant, green grass range save in the consumption of high-priced grains, but the green feed will provide certain critical ingredients so necessary for proper growth and development of pullets. Legume hays are a good source of vitamins A and G and also supply proteins and minerals.

III. Prevent feed wastage.

(a) Use hoppers from which poultry cannot waste feed.

(b) Provide at least three hoppers five feet long per 100 hens.

(c) Never fill the hoppers more than two-thirds full.

(d) Keep rats and mice out of the feed. It has been stated authoritatively that one rat will consume or destroy 100 pounds of feed in a year.

IV. Hatch chicks at various seasons of the year.

(a) By so doing, labor and housing space are better utilized.

(b) A more uniform egg production will result.

V. Feed efficiently.

(a) Use hoppers that are preferably not more than 6 inches deep and 8 inches wide at the bottom.

(b) Adjust reels or guards so that hens will not bump their heads while eating.

(c) Locate hoppers in well-lighted place, perpendicular to light openings.

(d) Feed fresh mash daily in an amount which the birds will consume in approximately 24 hours.

(e) Stir mash with hands when entering the pens to encourage increased mash consumption.

(f) Have mash before the birds at all times.

(g) Total feed consumption is more important than the exact proportion of mash and grain. One hundred Leghorn hens should consume from 24 to 27 pounds of feed per day. The heavy breeds should consume from 27 to 30 pounds of feed daily.

(h) Supply plenty of fresh water and place water containers near mash hoppers. Provide means for keeping the water from freezing.

(i) Use artificial lights wisely. Provide not over a 13 to 14 hour day. Toward the end of the hen's laying year, again continue the use of lights.

VI. Reduce laying house mortality.

(a) Provide at least 3½ to 4 square feet of floor space per bird.

(b) Curb cannibalism:

(1) Use whole oats or legume hay.

(2) Construct nests in such a manner that the birds will not be picked while laying.

(3) If necessary, use anti-pick devices on beaks.

(c) Cull non-producers constantly.

(d) Dispose of old birds before housing pullets.

(e) Control body lice by the use of nicotine sulphate on the roosts a half hour before roosting time. Repeat treatment in 10 days. Control red mites by the use of creosote paint or similar material.

Successful management of a laying flock consists of a well-organized business of sufficient size and volume to make it worthwhile for the owner or operator to put his soul into the business. High annual egg production, good fall and winter egg production, low mortality, strict culling and labor efficiency will result in a sucessful poultry enterprise.

MEETING BROILER PRODUCTION PROBLEMS IN 1944

by

PROF. EDMUND HOFFMAN, Poultry Department, University of Delaware

The broiler industry will have its share of problems in 1944. Their solution, and they will be solved, depends primarily upon development of an organization of broiler growers to speak authoritatively for the industry. Such an organization will need to be founded on sound principles and run on sound policies, avoiding petty and selfish motives.

Under present-day conditions, it is imperative that every group be in a position to have its case and its cause stated honestly when decisions that seriously affect it are being made in Washington. A broiler growers' organization needs prestige and competent leadership, if it is to represent the industry adequately. An organization is needed of the caliber of Neppco, which has rendered such valiant service to the poultrymen of the North East this year.

Research at the Delaware Agricultural Experiment Station indicates that the feed companies could help in overcoming the poor feed quality by producing a high-protein, high-vitamin mash to be fed the first 6 weeks of feeding period, so that the broilers could be gotten off to the best possible start.

Only 1/6 of the total feed consumption of the broiler is during this period, when their protein and vitamin requirements are greatest.

With corn, alfalfa leaf meal, and corn gluten meal in rather scanty supply, the feed companies could make a further contribution toward solving the 1944 problem by formulating a special pigment-producing finishing mash. Work at the Maryland Station has shown that the desired yellow shanks and beaks can be produced very rapidly.

The broiler producer himself will find that he must become more efficient if he is to profit during 1944. This means that he must raise a larger percentage of his broilers and that he must grow them rapidly. Attention should be given to securing chicks of a rapid-growing, rapid-feathering cross of good livability, rather than to put too much emphasis on price.

Although crowding has paid in the past, the producer will find that the increased gain and lower mortality secured by starting only 450 chicks per stove and giving them 2/3 of a square foot of floor space per bird will make such a program profitable in 1944. The new mashes do not perform as well under crowded conditions. Furthermore, the Army purchasing program has put more and more emphasis on larger size and good quality.

Careful management, which means close attention to such details as heat, ventilation, litter and prompt diagnosis and treatment of diseases, will help to reduce mortality and increase the rate of growth. It is now fairly well accepted that the addition of litter after an outbreak of coccidiosis is helpful and the feeding of a high vitamin supplement after an outbreak will hasten convalescence.

When the tremendous size of the industry is considered, it is readily apparent that the amount of research being done on its problems is far from adequate. If more work is to be done, however, it must be at the insistence and demand of producers themselves.

Broiler growers will probably have a less profitable year in 1944 than during 1943. Many of the more important problems of the industry can be solved only by organizing a strong group of producers that can speak for the broiler industry.

CONTROLLING THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT POULTRY DISEASES

by

DR. H. M. DEVOLT, University of Maryland

Some difference of opinion probably exists among flock owners and pathologists as to which diseases are the most important and serious. Some ailments that are mild and unimportant as a rule may change

their nature and cause serious loss. On the other hand, the most deadly diseases at times appear in a mild form and cause but little trouble. With this in mind, certain ailments will be mentioned for the reason that they cause serious loss to the poultry industry, and also because each furnishes an example of an important method of disease control.

Pullorum Disease

Pullorum disease in adult fowl is usually in the chronic form and is transmitted through the egg to the baby chick brood, where it breaks out in acute, rapidly spreading, and highly fatal form. It is not so commonly known, perhaps, that pullorum belongs to the typhoid family of germs and that the agglutination reaction employed for many years to detect typhoid in man is essentially the same test that forms the basis for the now widely used blood test in poultry flocks. The agglutination test is made by mixing together whole blood, or blood serum, and a test fluid called antigen. The antigen is a liquid made cloudy by myriads of killed pullorum germs. For the plate test, the liquid is colored. Briefly stated, the negative test remains unchanged while the positive one curdles or clumps. Of chief importance to the agglutination reaction are the freshness of the blood sample, the proportion of blood and antigen, the temperature at which the test is made, the length of time allowed for the reaction, and the light conditions under which the reaction is read. The flock owner and hatcheryman who understands the general nature of the test will be better able to cooperate with officials in control of the disease.

There are two forms in which the agglutination test is usually applied in the poultry flock. One is the whole blood, field, strained-antigen or plate test made at the farm while the suspected fowls are kept close at hand on a suitable holding device. The plate test is highly practical, since it makes unnecessary the sending of individual blood samples to the laboratory, and eliminates a second handling of the flock for the purpose of removing reactors. Also, the plate test elimintes a considerable amount of record keeping and so a possible source of error. On the other hand, the plate test is less accurate than the tube method, and has been especially unsatisfactory in turkeys.

When samples are taken to the laboratory for the tube test, a somewhat more exact proportion of test fluids can be mixed, the test is given a longer reaction period, can be held at constant temperature, and read under standard light conditions. Satisfactory testing, however, can and has been done in many flocks by both methods.

At the present time, more than half a million tests are completed annually, and practically all hatcheries in the state have made use of the test.

The requirement for the Maryland-U.S. Pullorum-Tested class is that the flock must have less than 2% of reactors, thus making this group

identical with the U.S. Pullorum-Controlled group. If more than 2% of reactors are found on the initial test, the flock is retested free of charge until the requirements are met.

Since pullorum is not yet eradicated, the disease may get through to the baby chick brood in certain instances. Then, too, there is the possibility that chicks may become infected after leaving the incubator. In this event, much can be done to alleviate losses if the disease is detected early in its course and thorough hygienic measures taken promptly. The litter should be removed and burned, the pen disinfected thoroughly, and all chicks showing symptoms destroyed. Particular care should be taken to clean and disinfect all feed and water containers. The flock owner should be suspicious of chicks found dead in shipping boxes. These can be sent to the nearest laboratory for diagnosis and if found diseased, control measures should be started at once. The young chick does not react well to the blood test, but those surviving the outbreak and intended for breeders must be blood-tested after reaching maturity. There is a tendency for survivors to become carriers of the disease and lay infected eggs when they mature. This illustrates the cycle of the disease. The measures used in the control of pullorum illustrate the use of a biological test in control of poultry disease. Other ailments of fowls controlled by biological tests are fowl typhoid, tuberculosis, and possibly, cholera.

Coccidiosis

Parasitic and protozoan diseases, including coccidiosis, worms and a few other parasites, have been calculated to cause trouble in more than 40% of the fowls brought to the diagnostic laboratory for examination. In such cases, coccidia are by far the most common parasite present. Coccidiosis is commonly found wherever chickens are kept.

Since the causative parasites are frequently voided in the droppings which soon form dust, it follows that coccidia constitute one of the most common forms of dust-borne contaminations.

Unlike certain ailments caused by germs, coccidiosis is confined to one part of the body, namely the intestinal tract. The causative parasites are small organisms, midway in size between a germ and a worm. They cannot be seen with the naked eye. There are about seven different species that affect chickens.

Two principal forms of the disease are encountered. These are the acute, or rapidly developing, and the chronic, or slow type, of the ailment. Acute coccidiosis is most common in chicks two to ten weeks of age. It is confined to the ceca or blind pouches of the intestine. This form of the ailment is caused principally by one species called *Eimeria tenella.* Invasive forms of this parasite burrow into the cecal wall so rapidly and in such large numbers as to cause internal bleeding. Hence,

blood stained droppings are a cardinal symptom. Chronic coccidiosis, on the other hand, may be caused by one or more species of coccidia. They affect the gut just below the gizzard. This type is sometimes called duodenal coccidiosis. While internal bleeding seldom occurs, the parasites burrow so deeply into the intestinal wall as to destroy digestive glands and interfere with the absorption of food. Affected birds gradually grow thin and pale. Chronic coccidiosis is encoundered most commonly during the later growing period or early adult life and not infrequently follows acute coccidiosis.

The disease is spread from fowl to fowl by a resistant form called an oocyst that is thrown out of the body in the droppings. Healthy fowls contract the disease by taking such organisms into the system with contaminated feed and water. The most vulnerable stage in the life cycle of the coccidial parasites is the freshly voided oocyst which will not produce disease if ingested immediately. In order to become infectious, it must lie on the poultry house floor or ground for about two days and undergo a stage of development known as sporulation.

While there are several medicines that appear at times to lighten the attack of coccidiosis, or make it more difficult for the parasites to obtain a hold in the intestine, there is not at the present time an officially recognized cure that can be guaranteed to work in all cases. This results not from the fact that chickens respond less favorably to drugs than other domestic creatures or men, but rather because it is not economical to hospitalize chickens and administer thorough and repeated dosage of medicines.

In promoting hygienic management to control the disease the following points should be kept in mind:—

1. Avoid crowding. The larger the group the more easily disease spreads.
2. Keep culls cleaned out of the brood.
3. If managerial factors are responsible for the production of too many culls, remove the fundamental cause. Culls often are the first to contract disease.
4. Keep litter bright and clean and, above all, dry. Moisture favors the sporulation of coccidia.
5. In acute coccidiosis, change the litter every day or two for about a week and remove affected chicks. Built-up litter has increased in popularity.
6. Following the removal of contaminated litter, coccidia on the floor should be destroyed with an effective disinfectant.
7. Feed and water containers should be of such type that the contents are not easily contaminated with the feet or droppings.

8. Wire floors must be scrubbed frequently with a stiff brush in order to be kept bright and clean and in a sanitary condition.

9. If medicinal treatment is to be tried, the best results will be obtained under good hygienic conditions.

Hygienic managment for control of disease constitutes the basis for all disease prevention and the most effective measures in the absence of specific treatment.

Respiratory Diseases

Respiratory disease, comprising those ailments that commonly attack the air passages of the nose and throat, causes serious loss to the poultry industry. During the winter season such trouble is particularly costly. Whether respiratory diseases, or such ailments as nutritional deficiency diseases, fowl cholera, typhoid or others are more serious will depend on the experience of individuals.

Ailments included in the respiratory group are colds and roup, infectious laryngotracheitis, infectious bronchitis and sometimes fowl pox. Fortunately, effective vaccines are available for prevention of two of the above named. The others can be controlled by applying various measures.

Colds and Roup

Colds and roup in the chicken appear similar in many respects to colds in the human being. The term roup refers particularly to chronic colds characterized by swelling of the face or involvement of the eye. It would appear also that colds in the fowl result from the action of a virus, possibly complicated by the presence of pus-producing organisms.

In some cases, colds in the poultry flock appear as an epidemic, spreading rapidly and showing no particular preference for predisposing factors. Very often, however, colds and roup appear after resistance has been lowered by such factors as faulty ventilation, wet floors, poor care, or the presence of debilitating disease. There is reason to believe that colds appear in flock weaklings or culls and subsequently spread to healthy birds. In combatting colds, therefore, it is necessary to seek for and eliminate the underlying cause. During the winter months colds are found not infrequently in birds suffering from such debilitating diseases as chronic coccidiosis and worms. This is an added reason for keeping the flock well culled.

A condition closely resembling colds is caused by a deficiency of vitamin A and is called nutritional roup. Addition to the ration of the necessary vitamin brings prompt relief. Some attempts have been made to treat colds in chickens with bacterins similar to those used for man. The use of such bacterins has not given uniformly beneficial results. This is understandable in the light of present knowledge concerning the causes of colds.

Infectious Laryngotracheitis

Infectious laryngotracheitis is an ailment most commonly affecting chickens during their first year in the laying house. It is caused by a filterable virus that attacks the upper part of the windpipe, producing a bloody mucus which is discharged during violent coughing and sneezing The onset is sudden and the mortality high. The disease sometimes attacks young chicks in a mild form. Those that survive have lasting immunity, and since it is possible to produce the causative virus in the laboratory, a preventive vaccine can be prepared. The immunizing agent is applied to the vent with a brush when the birds are three to five months of age. It can be used also to stop the disease during winter months when the flock is in production. Since the vaccine contains the living causative virus, all birds on the premises should be treated at one time or kept in isolation.

Infectious Bronchitis

Infectious bronchitis is also caused by a filterable virus. This ailment is most common in young chicks and may appear a few days after hatching. The principal symptoms are difficult breathing or gasping. Mortality may be high. The disease also attacks older chickens and grown fowls, but is mild. Recovery is followed by complete immunity, but there is not available on the market, at the present time, a vaccine against this ailment. Experience has shown, however, that in the majority of cases the addition of supplemental cod-liver or feeding-oil to the ration for about two weeks hastens recovery. This apparent beneficial effect probably results from the vitamin A content of the oil, since the relationship between vitamin A and resistance of the respiratory system is well known.

Fowl Pox

Fowl or chicken pox is one of the most prevalent of the poultry diseases. It is familiar to many flock owners in the form of grayish-brown scabs on unfeathered parts of the head. In addition, the disease may involve the eye with roup-like symptoms, or cause canker in the mouth. Pox can be prevented by application of vaccine and the simultaneous treatment of chickens for laryngotracheitis and pox has been attended with good results. Vaccination of adult flocks with chicken pox vaccine cannot be recommended because of the severe systemic reaction that sometimes occurs. The application of pigeon pox vaccine at this age is considered safe. This product confers an immunity for only a few months' duration, but does not cause severe reactions, as a rule.

Three methods of disease control and prevention have been mentioned in connection with the ailments discussed. There are biological tests, hygienic flock management, and vaccination. To these three should be added a fourth, namely, proper feeding for prevention of nutritional

disease. When full reliance is placed on rational methods, rejecting sensational cures and panaceas, the poultry disease control program is most effective.

EGG AND INCUBATION FACTORS AFFECTING HATCHABILITY AND CHICK QUALITY

DR. R. E. PHILLIPS, Poultry Department, University of Maryland

Many branches of poultry husbandry would have to be considered to thoroughly cover this subject. By omitting the fields of genetics and nutrition, the discussion might begin with flock management.

It is known that the current rate of egg production is linked with hatchability. Females which lay 4 to 6 eggs per week have a higher percentage hatchability than low producing hens. It has also been established that previous egg production has little or no influence upon hatchability, provided the diet is adequate. Under the same conditions the use of lights is not detrimental because maximum productivity is not obtained unless the birds have a 13-14 hour "working day".

In addition to breeding, feeding and flock management the treatment or care of hatching eggs is particularly important. A freshly-laid, fertile egg contains a living embryo, so special handling is necessary to avoid killing the germ. Hatching eggs should be cooled as soon after laying as possible. The optimum temperature for holding hatching eggs is 50°-55° F. A temperature below the optimum is better than a 70°-75° F. holding temperature.

Even though the husbandry practices are satisfactory for good hatchability, faulty incubation methods can cause poor hatchability. Such factors as ventilation, temperature, turning, humidity and ordinary common sense contribute to the successful operation of an incubator. The incubator and incubator room must be adequately ventilated. Operating forced-draft incubators at a temperature of 99°-100° F. has proved quite satisfactory and turning the eggs in the machines up to 8 times daily seems most desirable.

Inadequate information is available as to what are the optimum humidity requirements for perfect incubation. Particularly in Maryland, where the climate is quite humid, this may be an especially important problem to which not enough attention is being given. It appears that eggs of different breeds may require a different incubation humidity, if maximum results are to be obtained. When the abdomens of day-old chicks are full and hard, it is time to see about lowering the incubator humidity. A chick actually cuts its way out of the shell, and, if sufficient dehydration of the egg has not taken place during the fore part of the incubation period to permit the chick to turn around inside the egg, it will die due to strangulation or exhaustion.

Another factor that hatcherymen might consider is the difference in shell texture at the beginning and end of the hatching season. Since the thickness of the shell decreases as the hatching season progresses, it is evident that less incubator humidity is needed the first part of the hatching season in order that the eggs will be dried down sufficiently to give good hatchability and good chick quality.

BUSINESS SESSION

On the roll call of delegates, the credentials committee reported the following directors and delegates qualified and dues paid for their respective organizations:

Harford County, Poultry Association, Acting Director, Clarence E. Streett, Delegates, Robert Foard, Fred H. Scotten.

Tri-County Poultry Association, W. A. Spearin, Acting Director, Delegate M. F. Uphoff.

Talbot County Poultry Association, Director R. C. Morris, Delegates Mrs. W. W. Hopkins and R. S. Brown.

Dorchester County Poultry Association, Director A. R. Peterson, Delegates, Walter W. Lankford and Firman Clifton, Jr.

Maryland Turkey Growers Association, Director, Mrs. A. W. Sattler, Delegate Mrs. Harry Williams.

Queen Anne County Poultry Association, Director William Ratcliffe, Delegate, J. Walter Eby.

Anne Arundel County Poultry Association, Director Sam Ahmuty, Delegates, Earl B. Howard and Pere R. Benton.

Caroline County Poultry Association, Director Mrs. C. J. Kern, Delegates, H. H. Rieck and F. D. Ziegler.

Treasurer's Report

Cash account January 2, 1943	$ 805.77
Received from Secretary	1,340.73
Received for dues 1943	68.75
Received for dues 1944	56.00
Total	$2,271.25
DISBURSEMENTS	$1,515.96
The disbursements were as follows:	
Dues to N.E.P.P.C.	$ 100.00
Dues to Farm Brueau	20.00
Contributions to National Poultry & Egg Board	50.00
Purchasing Film, "Nature's Defense Package"	150.00

Purchasing 5—$100 U.S. G Bonds		370.00
For solicitation—Print and Postage of 1943 Poultry Year Book		413.17
For solicitation—Printing and Postage of 1944 Poultry Year Book to date		108.00
Secretary's postage—Honorarium and Expenses for speakers at annual meeting and dinners for Directors and officers expenses	$	304.79
Total		$1,515.96
Balance in Bank January 2, 1944	$	755.29

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Couden seconded that the treasurer's report be accepted. Motion carried.

Treasurer, Mrs. Hopkins, made the following report on the 1943 and 1944 year book:

The following statement refers to the 1943 Poultry Year Book:

There was a total of 60 advertisements—Received checks for all 60 Ads, making a total of	$1,006.98
Expenses for solicitation Printing and Postage	413.17
Balance	$ 593.81

The following statement refers to the 1944 Poultry Year Book:

There is a total of 57 Ads.	
Received payments to date from 12 advertisers	$ 159.50
Expenses to date for solicitation— Printing and Postage	$ 161.77

The President suggested the investment of Council funds in the coming 4th War Bond Drive to the Extent of the Treasurer's balance above $500.00, this sum to be retained as a working balance. Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Couden seconded that the Executive Committee be authorized to purchase bonds in accordance with this policy. Motion carried.

Fresh Egg Program Commtitee. Chairman J. W. Snoddy and the Secretary reported the Fresh Egg Program work for 1943 and outlook for 1944 as per the following reports:

Chairman's Report

The work of our fresh egg program has been carried on despite total war, Federal control and clerical handicaps as you will see from Mr. Rice's report. We should feel proud of the accomplishments achieved under war conditions.

The outlook for 1944 is anything but bright. Again war has reached into the personnel of the Poultry Department taking Mr. Williams into

the Navy. None of the workers lost to military service have been replaced.

This brings up the matter of relative importance of the various lines of work under the War Program. At present, we should consider carefully the question as to which is more important, flock inspection work or the continuation of the Fresh Egg Program. Without production, we cannot have consumption; without consumption, production is of no value. There is need for much work along both lines. Under Federal control there is special need for consumer education. The housewife should be taught how to buy eggs according to her needs and uses. This is more important now than before the war, eggs being a vital war food. We may be able to make greater progress under war conditions than if we wait until after the war. We should not and do not oppose flock and hatchery inspection work when it does not interfere with the fresh egg program. It should be easier to find someone to carry on flock inspection than one to do effective work with the fresh egg program. Much time and effort has been devoted to the accumulation of material to be used in the furtherance of the fresh egg program. The interests of the consuming public and of the producer can be better served by maintaining the fresh egg program.

We should be broad-minded enough to look at the whole thing fairly from the taxpayer's standpoint. After all, it is the tax-payer who bears the cost of any program attempted. We should analyze the costs and benefits of the two programs and determine which will benefit the greatest number of people. Breeders should have progressed far enough in their work to carry on alone for the duration or until someone is found to direct flock inspection. On the other hand, the fresh egg program is in its infancy; it needs nursing and guidance. It will help every consumer to buy eggs properly for particular uses. It will help every farmer to handle and market his eggs so as to obtain maximum price. When the farmer finds that he can sell more eggs for more money under the fresh egg program, he will do so. Until that time arrives he will not be interested in the purchase of better grade chicks. Farmers are not particularly interested in getting more eggs but they are intensely interested in getting more money for the eggs they now produce. This is where our fresh egg program can assist in the marketing of better quality eggs through its educational program.

I firmly believe the very foundation of our entire industry lies in the building up of a quality-egg consciousness on the part of the consuming public and the producer alike. We have been trying to build our industry from the top down rather than from the foundation up. We have laid this foundation by the inauguration of our fresh egg program. Let us continue to support it.

Secretary's Report

W. H. RICE

Five lines of activities were followed in the educational work in this program in 1943, namely,

(1) Producer education and cooperation.

(2) Wholesale Egg Dealers including Country buyers.

(3) Retail Merchants and Producer Retailers.

(4) Consumer educational work.

(5) War emergency program work, including price ceilings, restrictive orders and black markets.

1. *Producer Program.* Work with producers consisted of the preparation and distribution of special literature in the form of circulars on quality egg production and marketing, special bulletins on grading and price ceilings, meetings, visits to individuals on quality production and grading, and distribution of literature and egg carton inserts and other related lines.

Eight producer meetings with 741 in attendance were held, at which grading and fresh egg quality were demonstrated and the picture "Nature's Defense Package" was shown. Copies of the Producer Circular, Producing Quality Eggs, 3 price ceiling and War Food order bulletins, 6 circular letters and other material were mailed to a list of about 1,500 hatcherymen and producers. This involves about 20,000 pieces of literature in addition to about 40,000 egg carton inserts being placed with 41 leading producer retailers near Baltimore and Washington.

2. *Wholesale Egg Dealers and Country Buyers.* It is well known that wholesale egg dealers, at least in Maryland, have their business built upon the basis of buying on a non-grading or unofficial grade basis and selling principally on unofficial grades. This means a speculative business. Wholesale egg dealers and country egg buyers were visited in nearly all counties of the state, but especially in Baltimore, in order to secure their reaction to the program, offer our cooperation and to encourage buying and selling on a "fresh" grade basis.

Visits to 46 such dealers indicate that any material progress with the "fresh" egg or any form of recognized grading program will come principally through the pressure of retailer and consumer demand. A special circular on the program, "Information for Wholesalers and Retailers" was prepared and distributed to about 1,500 wholesalers and retail stores, principally retailers.

Egg shortages in relation to demand caused eggs to move in both wholesale and retail channels in 1943 more rapidly than usual.

Price ceilings on eggs, restrictive orders of F.D.A., and the labor shortages in 1943 precluded the possibility of any material progress with a voluntary wholesale program.

3. *Retail Merchants Work.* The work with retail stores was inaugurated at the monthly meeting of the Maryland Independent Retail Grocers Association in Baltimore on January 5, when 710 merchants heard Dr. F. B. Bomberger outline the program, saw the specialist demonstrate "what makes a fresh egg fresh", and Homer I. Huntington tell of the retail store work throughout the country on Quality Egg Merchandising.

Following this meeting, 89 retail store visits were made to contact managers on the program and distribute approximately 5,000 copies each of the circulars—"Protective Food" and "Consumer's Egg Quiz", and about 3,000 copies of the Consumer Information Service bulletins. Bulletin board pockets in retail stores, as developed by Mr. R. C. Hawes, Marketing Specialist of the Extension Service, were utilized, and Mr. Hawes was very helpful and cooperative in this work. A special circular on the program for wholesalers and retailers was prepared and about 3,000 of these were distributed at stores, the Independent Retailers Meeting, and by mail.

The advent of food rationing, together with increasing labor shortages, placed difficulties on retail grocers with which everyone is familiar. In the face of these wartime problems, it was a most unfavorable time to secure cooperation of retailers in view of consumer demands exceeding egg supplies most of the year. Up-grading and up-pricing were practiced in many stores, but rigid inspections and enforcement under existing emergency conditions would doubtless have placed the program and the Fresh Egg Law at a distinct disadvantage when the swing to normalcy after the war occurs. Taking advantage of merchants laboring under wartime hardships could have been done, but its advisability in a long-time program, which we seek to popularize on its merits, would have been a questionable policy.

Egg carton inserts were utilized by several retail merchants in Baltimore, Frederick, Hagerstown and Cumberland, but labor shortages did not favor their widespread use.

4. *Consumer Educational Work.* The Consumer Program was inaugurated January 5, in Baltimore at Goucher College at a meeting of leaders of Home Economics workers, Red Cross, Women's Clubs, Consumer Centers, War Service Centers and similar groups.

Nine consumer meetings, with 516 attending, were held. At these meetings, the demonstration lecture "What Makes a Fresh Egg Fresh" was given and the movie "Nature's Defense Package", a copy of which was contributed to this program by the Council, was shown. Over 8,000

pieces of literature covering Protective Food and Egg Quiz circulars, consumer service bulletins and Poultry and Egg National Board literature were distributed and placed with leaders attending.

A list of about 1,500 Home Economists, Red Cross, Women's Clubs and other consumer leaders was compiled and copies of all literature, including the lecture program circular, was mailed them and farm organization leaders throughout the State. Through meetings, conferences and literature distributed, it is conservatively estimated that not less than 50,000 people have been reached by the program in 1943.

5. *War Emergency Work.* As already pointed out, food rationing, price ceilings, and restrictive orders including military purchases of eggs and poultry, have dominated the marketing and consumption field in 1943.

Requests for cooperation with the Food Distribution Administration and Office of Price Administration, together with the confusion existing over ceiling prices and restrictive orders, made emergency work a necessary part of the Quality Egg Program during the year. In this connection, cooperation was given these agencies in holding 16 meetings with 948 attending, besides conferences on these matters.

Price ceiling and restrictive order information in simplified form was an important problem dealt with in special service bulletins in 3 issues to producers, 2 to turkey growers and 2 to consumers during the year.

Outlook for 1944. Price ceilings and restrictive orders appear to be prominent in the picture for 1944, to meet the needs of military forces and inflation control. Additional drafting of men for mliitary service makes the labor outlook darker than anything we have yet seen. Charles Williams entered the service in December, leaving no one available to supervise the flock and hatchery work nor R.O.P. work.

The specialist has been asked to carry on most of this work in the emergency. With the limited office help available, it is evident that in order to carry the mounting work left by those in poultry work at the University who have entered the service and who have not been replaced, the time which can be spent on the Quality Egg Program in 1944 will be greatly reduced as compared to 1943.

The Auditing Committee

Mr. Ritter, Chairman of Auditing Committee reported that Treasurer's reports were in balance and books in good order. Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Couden seconded that the committee's report be accepted. Motion carried.

The President reported that no special session of the Legislature in 1944 was anticipated at this time and state legislation matters were quiet at present. However, he re-affirmed the position of the Council

in opposing national food subsidies and that a resolution would be presented later covering this subject.

Under new business, the President mentioned plans for organizing and developing a broiler industry section of Neppco and support for this project by the Council was requested. This was given through motion by Mr. Morris, seconded by Mr. Spearin, and the president appointed the following committee: Bound Phillips, Howard Harris, and Dr. Jull.

Report of Resolutions Committee

WHEREAS, the room necessary for holding the sessions of the annual State Poultry Council meetings proved to be inadequate,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Secretary of the Council be instructed to convey this information to the authorities in charge of making arrangements for these meetings and request that proper space be provided next year for our winter meetings.

WHEREAS, the success of the Maryland Poultry Products Show is due in large measure to the splendid support and assistance given by the Assistant County Agents R. W. Sutton, J. Wheeler Ensor, Roscoe C. Whipp, and Francis E. Rogers, and Vocational Agriculture Teacher Lee W. Adkins,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Secretary of the Council be requested to write and thank each of these parties for his invaluable assistance in preparing the exhibits and in judging the eggs and chicks.

WHEREAS, Mr. Charles Ritter very generously devoted so much of his time in securing advertising for the 1944 Year Book, which proved to be such a success,

THEREFORE, be it resolved, that the Secretary be instructed to write Mr. Ritter thanking him very sincerely for his splendid cooperation.

WHEREAS, subsidies have been proposed on various agricultural commodities, and

WHEREAS, the State Poultry Council is opposed to subsidies,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Secretary be requested to advise Maryland Senators and Congressmen of the opposition of the Maryland State Poultry Council to subsidies on eggs and poultry meat.

WHEREAS, the successful administration of the Maryland Fresh Egg Law and the supervision of the Maryland Poultry Improvement Plan require more time than Mr. Rice is able to give both fields,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the President of the Maryland Poultry Council be asked to consult with Dr. Symons to see if more

assistance cannot be secured for carrying on the work of the Maryland Poultry Improvement Plan.

The committee moves the adoption.

Mrs. W. W. Hopkins
Dr. M. A. Jull

The aforegoing resolutions were adopted individually and as a whole by motion made by Mrs. Hopkins, seconded by Mr. Brown.

Nominating Committee Report: Mr. Ritter of the Nominating Committee reported recommendtions of the committee that the present officers, except delegates to affiliated organizations, be re-elected. Mr. Couden moved, Mr. Brown seconded that nominations be closed and the Secretary cast a unanimous ballot. Motion carried.

Nominations for Director and Delegates to Farm Bureau: Mr. Couden moved the nominations of Mr. Rieck as director and Mr. Ritter and Mr. H. L. Altenburg delegates, with Mr. Potts and Mrs. Sattler as alternates. Mr. Couden moved and Mr. Brown seconded that nominations be closed and secretary cast a unanimous ballot. Motion carried.

The president thanked the Council for its support, and honor in re-electing him, and called for its continued support during the trying period ahead in 1944. He also admonished the Council members to support the Council and NEPPCO in meeting the problems facing the industry in 1944. The President also, on behalf of the Council, congratulated Mrs. C. J. Kern as president of the affiliated women of the Farm Bureau. The business meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m. Following the meeting three reels of pictures were shown on important developments in the poultry industry.

ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

Maryland Nurserymen's Association

Baltimore, Maryland, January 12, 1944

The Annual Winter Meeting of the Maryland Nurserymen's Association was held at the Lord Baltimore Hotel in Baltimore on January 12, 1944, with E. Sam Hemming presiding.

"Current and Post-War Problems" were discussed by Dr. T. B. Symons, Dean and Director of Agriculture at the University of Maryland. He outlined the seriousness of the labor situation, the need for food, and the wisdom of giving thought to post-war problems.

Dr. Symons reported that in this country during the last three years 1,300,000 persons left the farm to move elsewhere, and that 1,100,000 farm people are employed in industry, and another 1,250,000 farm people have gone into the armed services. Last year the farmers of Maryland were able to squeeze through with the aid of 2,000 imported Bahamians. The Maryland Extension Service made 100,000 placements for farm work in the state.

Dr. Symons pointed out the need for food production and reviewed briefly the Victory Garden Program. He advised nurserymen to continue to furnish plants for this program.

Ten major war problems reviewed by him are:

1. Concern for efficiency.
2. The problem of inflation.
3. The kind of world trade policy to be adopted.
4. The question of free enterprise.
5. Coordination of government agencies for agriculture.
6. An economy favorable to agriculture.
7. Organization of unorganized farmers.
8. Development of livestock and crops with which we can compete.
9. Taxes and road improvement.
10. Conservation of our soils.

The Question of Guarantees—The report of Paul Hofman, M. G. Coplen and Daniel Stoner on Uniform Agreements produced a lively

discussion on whether to guarantee. The discussion resulted in a statement of policy, as follows: "As the life of trees and plants after they leave our hands and care cannot be guaranteed, all claims for replacement will be adjusted, based on full information and fairness to both parties concerned".

Luncheon Meeting

Henry Hohman was toastmaster, and one of the Association's distinguished members, Philip Wagner, Editor of the Baltimore Sun, spoke. He mentioned the possibility of a wine industry for the East and spoke briefly of his hobby nursery, where he is experimenting with hybrid wine grapes that are hardy in the East. From his broad knowledge, Mr. Wagner gave a most interesting talk on present-day world events and future problems.

Victory Gardens—Mrs. Donaldson told the nurserymen that after the war people will demand new flowers and plants. She pointed out that in 1943, $16,000,000 were spent for flowers, against $7,476,000 in 1937.

Emphasizing the need for vegetable plants in the victory garden program, Mrs. Donaldson urged the nurserymen to cooperate in their production. She said that through a vegetable plant business they can build confidence with customers. She called attention to M. G. Coplen's victory garden box as one method of marketing plants. Last year, Mr. Coplen marketed a victory garden box consisting of tomato, cabbage, eggplant and pepper plants.

Mrs. Donaldson introduced J. Morton Franklin, in charge of victory garden work in Washington, D. C., who reviewed some of the problems connected with plant production.

Pest Control and Spray Problems—Dr. Ernest N. Cory of the University of Maryland pointed out the wisdom of a regular spray schedule and stated that clean, healthy nursery stock is the best guarantee a nurseryman can give. He emphasized the value of using plant material not subject to major pests. Because of the unsettled conditions, he advised nurserymen to purchase their spray materials now. Rotenone and pyrethrum have been taken over largely by the military, he said, and the supplies for spraying will be limited.

Dr. Cory discussed briefly a new pest of mimosa, the mimosa webworm.

Pruning Old Fruit Trees—Varieties of fruit suited to home gardens and orchards, and methods of pruning and rehabilitating old and established fruit trees were discussed by A. F. Vierheller, extension horticulturist. He advised against trimming too hard the first time. Trim out the small center and under branches, he said. Big cuts induce lots of water sprouts.

Mr. Vierheller said that while we hear much about dwarf fruit trees, they are hard to get. The following are fruits recommended for home

planting in Maryland, and their use is recommended in the order given: *Apples;* Transparent, Summer Rambo, Grimes, Jonathan, Delicious, Rome, Staymen and York. *Peaches;* Jubilee, Vedet, Hale Haven, Elberta and Salberta; Cumberland is a good white. *Pears;* Seckel is best. *Plums;* Do not do well in Maryland; Sapa, Opata, Methley, Agen and Damson are fair growers. *Sour Cherries;* Large Montmorency and Richmond; *Sweet Cheries;* Freeze out and die; Windsor Bing and Schmidts are best. *Strawberries;* Fairfax, Blakemore and Catskill are best; Gem is ever-bearing; Starbright is new and looks good. Eldorado blackberries and dewberries are trouble-proof if you get the true variety. Virus diseases and the rose chafer give trouble with raspberries.

Memorial Parks for Soldiers—A paper by Ernest Hemming on "Memorial Parks for Soldiers" was read by R. S. Johnston. C. W. Price reported on the progress of the A. A. N. committee on Memorial Parks. Establishment of memorial parks in all communities was suggested and aroused much interest.

Ethical Standards—Homer Kemp of Bountiful Ridge Nurseries gave an address on ethical standards and cooperation in the nursery business. He defined ethical as meaning "of character", the basic principle of right action, the science of human duty acting through man's sense of right. He said that confidence comes from reasonable trade ethics. He advocated more cooperation among nurserymen.

Officers Elected—President, D. B. Stoner; 1st Vice-President, Homer Kemp; 2nd Vice-President, L. H. Willis; Secretary, Paul S. Hofman; Treasurer, Carville G. Akehurst. Executive Committee: (Incumbent members), J. F. Hetzer, P. S. Hofman, Roland Bailey, R. S. Johnston; (New members), Andrew Simon, Patsy Donofrio, Joseph Harrison, E. Sam Hemming. Educational Secretary, George S. Langford. Delegate to the Farm Bureau, Henry Hohman.

INDEX

Page

B

Baldwin, Hon. H. Streett—Address 3
Batjer, L. P.—Address 18

C

Cobb, Alex D.—Address 45
Corns, Major Joseph B.—Address 176
Cotterman, H. F.—Presentation of Awards 48

D

De Vault, S. H.—Address 35, 44
DeVolt, H. M.—Address 209
Dickerson, W. H., Jr.—Address 149

F

Foster, A. O.—Address 169
Fry, Mrs. Edwin D.—Report 16
Fulton, Stanley M.—Address 92

G

Graham, C.—Address 124

H

Hamlet, John N.—Address 119
Haut, I. C.—Address 93, 107, 142
Hayes, Brigadier General Philip—Address 66
Hoffman, Edmund Hoffman—Address 208
Hough, W. S.—Address 131
Hunt, Wells E.—Address 180

K

Knandel, H. C.—Address 205
Kilgore, Ben—Address 57

L

Leinbach, Fred H.—Address 174

M

Magruder, John W.—Address 148
Meade, DeVoe—Address 184
Miller, Carroll R.—Address 110, 114
Miller, Henry W., Jr.—Address 121
Moore, Frank E.—Address 202
Moore, L. A.—Address 145
Motz, Fred A.—Address 134

Page

N

Nystrom, Paul E.—Address 123

O

Outhouse, James B.—Address 188

P

Parker, F. W.—Address 105
Phillips, R. E.—Address 215

S

Schrader, A. L.—Address 93
Sewell, Mrs. Charles—Address 52
Shrader, H. L.—Address 199
Symons, T. B.—Report 224

T

Turk, K. L.—Address 144, 181
Turner, P. C.—Report 21
Turner, Zach—Report 12
Tydings, Senator Millard E.—Address 191

V

Vierheller, A. F.—Report 106

W

Weagly, R. C. F.—Address 23
Wight, Dan E.—Remarks 190
Wise, C. E., Jr.—Reports 20, 69

DO NOT CIRCULATE

UNIV. OF MD COLLEGE PARK
3 1430 04322743 0

113817

DO NOT CIRCULATE